THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME THIRTY-SEVEN SECOND QUARTER, 1943

The cost of this issue is paid by income from the George Watson Cole Publication Fund

The Grammatical Writings of William Lily, ?1468-?1523*

By VINCENT JOSEPH FLYNN

THERE has long existed, and there still exists to-day, considerable confusion about the grammatical writings of William Lily. Vague and conflicting statements on the subject appear in biographical accounts of the author, and in different studies of the period which make occasional reference to him. In this paper I have set out to clear up this confusion: to determine precisely what Lily wrote, to describe each item with some fullness, to sketch the history and indicate the importance of each, and, finally, to treat in greater detail the compilation that passed under Lily's name for over three hundred years.

It is this last named work which is most commonly meant when one speaks of "Lily's Grammar." But we often find the term applied to one or another of Lily's separate publications—hence the confusion and contradictions. First of all, people sometimes speak of "Lily's Grammar" when they mean an accidence by John Colet and a syntax by Lily, both in English, published to-

* This paper is the "essential portion" of the author's doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago, 1939, *The Life and Works of William Lily*.

gether in one small volume, the text later taken up by Cardinal Wolsey. More often they have in mind a short but pithy syntax in Latin written by Lily and revised by Erasmus—a book which had an enormous vogue, especially on the Continent, for three-quarters of a century. Occasionally they seem to mean a set of Latin verses by Lily on the rules for the gender of nouns and the conjugation of verbs. These three treatises were used after Lily's death in putting together what became popularly known as "Lily's Grammar." I shall describe each of the four in order.

Colet's Aeditio and Lily's Rudimenta Grammatices

This was apparently the first of the series; the earliest known edition is that of 1527, but Colet's part bears a letter of dedication to Lily, dated in some editions 1509[1] and in others 1510.[2]

Cardinal Gasquet has described a manuscript schoolbook coming from the cloister school of Canterbury in the latter half of the fifteenth century; it was handed down from one generation of schoolboys to another, and was possibly used by young Reginald Pole long before he thought of busying himself with the affairs of the mighty. The codex contains a dictionary, and the *Grecismus* of Evrard de Bethune;[3] but it likewise includes prayers, religious instruction, and rules for the manners and daily life of a monk.[4] Colet's grammar follows in the same tradition; correct

[1] For example, in the edition of Peter Treveris, London, 1529, and that of Martin Caesar, Antwerp, 1535, both in the form known as "Wolsey's Grammar" (see below, pp. 95-98). A copy of each is in the British Museum.

[2] For example, in the edition of Wynkyn de Worde, 1534, a copy of which is in the British Museum; and in the edition of 1527 (*s. l. et typ.*), represented by the unique copy in the library of Peterborough Cathedral. This last has been reprinted in Samuel Blach. *Shakespeares Lateingrammatik, Lilys Grammatica Latina nach der ältesten bekannten Ausgabe von 1527 und für Shakespeare in Betracht kommenden Ausgabe von 1566 (London, R. Wolfius)*. In: *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLIV, 1908, pp. 65-177; XLV, 1909, pp. 51-100.

[3] A thirteenth-century treatise on grammar in verse, one of the two most popular grammars of the late Middle Ages; the other was the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei.

[4] Francis A. Gasquet. *The Canterbury Claustral School in the Fifteenth Century*. In: *The Old English Bible and Other Essays*, London, 1897, pp. 260-285.

Latin is dear to the Dean's heart, but good manners and good morals are dearer. First of all come the articles of admission to the new school;[5] then comes Colet's little catechism; next, the articles of faith; a short explanation of the seven sacraments; a few words on charity, subdivided into the love of God, the love of one's own self, the love of one's neighbor; resolutions concerning the reception of the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist—"If I fall to synne I shal anone ryse agayne by penaunce and pure confessyon. . . . As often as I shal receyue my lord in sacrament, I shall with al study dispose me to pure clennes and deuocyon"; resolutions concerning sickness and death; forty-nine precepts of living; the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's prayer and the Hail Mary; two prayers presumably composed by Colet himself, the first beginning *Sancta Maria, uirgo, & mater Iesu,* the second called the *Oratiuncula ad Puerum Iesvm Scholae Praesidem,* still said at St. Paul's.[6] Next we have Colet's letter to his first high master, worthy of quoting in its entirety:

Colet suo Lilio Salutem

Accipe, optime ac literatissime Lili, libellum puerilis institutionis, in quo quidem eadem, quae fuerunt ab alijs tradita, ratione et ordine paulo (ni fallor) commodiore digessimus. Idque fecimus, ut elementa grammatices et felicius influerent in puerorum animos et tenacius inhaererent. Tuum erit, qui primus Es huius nouae Pauli scholae praeceptor, his rudimentis diligenter exercere pueros nostros, deinceps ad maiora profecturos. Nihil enim aeque mihi cordi est in praesenti quam ut paruuli Christi quam plurimum apud te proficiant cum literatura, tum bonis moribus, ad quod si eniteris, et IESVM puerorum praesidem tibi tuo studio demereberis et me plane felicem reddideris. Vale ex aedibus meis, Calen. Augu. An. MDX.[7]

Immediately afterwards comes the preface to the book, not only showing how and why Colet composed his grammar, but

[5] The text of these articles is given in J. H. Lupton's *A Life of John Colet,* 2d ed., London, 1909, pp. 285-292, together with most of the religious material that follows; in the *Shakespeare Jahrhbuch* reprint it is all found in Vol. XLIV, 1908, pp. 66-72.

[6] Cf. Lupton. *Colet,* p. 290, n. 1.

[7] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch,* XLIV, p. 73.

likewise reflecting his tender solicitude for the welfare of his young pupils. The piece breathes the gentleness and candid simplicity of the author's saintly life:

A lytell proheme to the boke

Al be it mani haue wryten and haue made certayne introduccyons in to latyn speche, called Donates and Accidens, in latyn tongue and in englysche, in such plenty that it shoulde seme to suffyse, Yet neuerthelesse for the loue and the zele that I haue vnto the new schole of Poules, and to the children of the same, somwhat I haue also compyled of the mater, and of the viii partes of grammer haue made this lytel boke, not thynkynge that I coude say ony thynge beter than hath be sayd before, but I toke this besynes, hauynge grete pleasure to shewe the testymony of my good mynde vnto the schole. In whiche lytel warke yf ony newe thynges be of me, it is alonely that I haue put tese partes in a more clere ordre, and haue made them a lytel more easy to yonge wyttes than (methynketh) they were before. Iudgyng that no thynghe may be to softe, nor to famylyer for lytel chyldren, specyally lernynge a tongue vnto them all straunge. In which lytel boke I haue lefte many thynges out of purpose, consyderyng the tendernes and small capacyte of lytel myndes: And that I haue spoken, also, I haue affyrmed it none otherwyse, but as it happeth moost comynly in latyn tongue. For many be the excepcyons, and harde it is ony thynge generally to assure in a speche soo varyous. I praye god all may be to his honour, and to the erudicyon and profyt of chyldren, my countre men Londoners specyally, whome dygestynge this lytel werke I had always before myn eyen, consyderynge more what was for them than to shewe ony grete connynge, wyllyng to speke the thynges often before spoken in suche maner as gladli yonge begynners and tender wyttes myght take and conceyue. Wherefore I praye you al lytel babys, al lytel chyldren, lerne gladly this lytel treatyse, and commende it dylygently vnto your memoryes. Trustynge of this begynnynge that ye shal procede and growe to parfyt lyterature, and come at the last to be grete clarkes. And lyfte vp your lytel whyte handes for me, whiche prayeth for you to god. To whom be al honour and imperyal maieste and glory. Amen.[8]

Prologi finis

All of this takes up eleven octavo pages, in the edition of 1527; then we come to the accidence proper, "An Introduceyon of the Parthes of Spekyng, for Children *and* Yonge Begynners, in to Latyn Speche." It requires forty-nine pages to make this introduction, which ends piously with an "Amen" and an epilogue

[8] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLIV, pp. 73-74.

pointing the way to further advancement in the language of Rome—the orthodox Renaissance doctrine of reading the classics and making their usage one's guide.

For redyng of good bokes, diligent informacyon of taught maysters, studyous aduertence and takyng hede of lerners, heryng eloquent men speke, and finally seasy [*sic*] imitacyon with tongue and penne, more auayleth shortly to gete the true eloquent speche, than all the tradicions, rules, and preceptes of maysters.[9]

Explicit Coleti aeditio

It has been pointed out that Colet probably got his idea for the title, *Aeditio*, from Donatus, the famous teacher of St. Jerome. Donatus had composed two short grammatical treatises, the *Ars Minor*, for beginners, and the *Ars Maior*, for students further advanced. The first of these was sometimes called the *Editio Prima Donati*, the second, the *Editio Secunda*. Both were very popular during the Middle Ages, indeed up to the time of Colet. Dr. Blach thinks that the relationship between the *Ars Minor* and the *Aeditio* was a very close one.

To me, however, the two seem quite unlike. The *Aeditio* is much the simpler, "a lytel more easy to yong wyttes." And the language is different. In the *Aeditio* there is nothing said about accidents, but the properties of the several parts of speech are explained in words more likely to be understood by a child. Compare Colet's treatment of the noun with that of Donatus:

A nowne is the name of a thynge that is and may be seen, felte, herde, or vnderstande, As the name of my hande in latyn is *Manus*, the name of a hous is *Domus*, the name of goodnes is *Bonitas*.

The dyuisyon of nownes

Nownes, or the names of thynges, some be substantyues, some be adiectyues: A nowne substantyue is that standeth by hym selfe, and loketh not for an other worde to be ioyned with hym.

A nowne adiectyue is that can not stande by hymselfe, but loketh to be ioyned *with* another word, as *Bonus, Pulcher;* whan I say in latin *Bonus:* good, or *pulcher:* fayre, it loketh to tell what is good, or what is fayre, and therefore it must be ioyned *with* an other worde, as a good childe: *Bonus puer*, A fayre

[9] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLV, p. 55.

woman: *Pulchra foemina.* And a nowne adiectyue, eyther it hath thre terminacions, as *Bonus, bona, bonum,* or elles it is declyned *with* thre artycles: *Hic, haec, hoc,* as *hic, haec, et hoc foelix.*[10]

After Colet's *Aeditio* comes the *Gulielmi Lilij Angli Rudimenta,* which bears the heading, "To make latyn." The first line of the famous little syntax is the familiar, "Whan I have an englysshe to be tourned into latin I shal reherse it twyes or thries and loke out the verbe." The whole thing occupies only thirteen pages. Lily's *Carmen de Moribus*[11] is printed next, followed by three four-line Latin poems, singing the praises of the great schoolmaster; they were written by John Rightwise, Richard Vernamus (in other editions spelled Vernanus), and Richard Gunsonus. The volume ends with the Greek alphabet, in contemporary continental fashion, and bears the annoyingly incomplete colophon *Venumdantur Londinij in cymiterio Sancti Pauli, prope scholam.* As a final touch the book reproduces the royal coat of arms.

The *Rudimenta* is a syntax, corresponding to the accidence of Colet, but much shorter and perhaps even more elementary. It begins with the problem of how to turn "an englysshe" into Latin; the student is first to "look out" the verb, which is defined for him and classified as either "principal" or otherwise. Directions are then given for finding the principal verb, after which the subject of the sentence is likewise isolated and described. Next we have definitions of the relative and the antecedent, followed by short notes on the case of the relative, on the interrogatives, and on impersonal verbs. The boy is now introduced to the "three concords" of grammar—rules for the agreement of verb and substantive, of adjective and substantive, and of relative and antecedent. Then under the heading "Dyuers rules longyng to the first concorde" we are given a discussion of all three concords.

[10] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch,* XLIV, p. 75.

[11] Or *Monita Paedagogica,* a poem in elegiac couplets, eighty-four lines in length, full of precepts and advice for the student of St. Paul's—quite in the tradition of mediaeval and Renaissance sapiential writings.

The rest of the text is taken up with "The knowledge of the oblique cases." Under this heading we have the simplest possible statement of the chief uses of the genitive and dative; under the accusative and ablative we get something fuller: we are told that "the accusatyue case answereth to this questyon who? or what? and cometh after the verb"; but that to this rule there are "dyuers excepcyons"—verbs having the same case after them as before, verbs having the genitive after them, the dative, or the ablative. Then we are told the chief rules for the use of the ablative, illustrated, as are all the rules, with well-chosen examples. The book ends with a few statements on "Cases with preposicyons," in which Lily treats place where, and motion to or from a place; like all the grammarians of his day, he makes no mention of the locative case, which he mistakes for the genitive singular of the first or second declension, or the ablative plural of the third.[12]

The *Rudimenta Grammatices* is not particularly well put together; there is some needless repetition, and there is a lack of order in the arrangement, part of which may perhaps be blamed upon the printers.[13] But it has the great merit of simplicity and clearness. There are no verses to be memorized, and for examples there are no difficult sentences from the classics. However, every statement that needs it has its illustration, made up no doubt from the first brief phrase or sentence that came into Lily's head. For instance, under the first concord we are told that "Two substantyues singuler wyl haue an adiectyue plurel, as Vergilius et Terentius sunt docti."

The sources of the *Rudimenta* I have been able to determine only in part. The title is the same as that employed by Perottus and by Sulpitius for grammars that were elementary only in comparison with the tomes of Priscian. Blach says that the book is a

[12] Some grammars (including some eighteenth-century editions of "Lily's Grammar") state the rule so as to include the ablative singular of the third, fourth and fifth declensions.

[13] See above, p. 90.

much shortened translation of Lily's *Libellus*,[14] and that it is similar to the *Longe Parvula*, which may therefore be considered a source.[15] As a matter of fact it has resemblances to all three of the *Pervula* group, and—apart from the question of dates—Lily might have made use of any or all of them. The introductory matter in all four of them is much the same; Lily states in declarative form what comes as question and answer in the *Pervula* series: "Whan I haue an englysshe to be tourned into latin I shal reherse it twyes or thries and loke out the verbe." Then, after directions for recognizing the verb: "If there be more verbes than one in the reason, the first is the principal verbe, so it be none infinityue mode," etc. The *Pervula* group have almost the same words, each slightly different, preceded by a question. The *Longe Parvula* begins thus: "What shalt thou do, whan thou hast an englysshe to make in latyn? I shal reherse myn englysshe ones, twyes or thryes, and loke out my pryncypal verbe."[16]

[14] *Absolutissimus de Octo Orationis Partium Libellus*, a short syntax in Latin. See below, pp. 98-101. The title varied, but it seldom contained the word *Absolutissimus*; it was often called the *Libellus* or the *De Octo* for the sake of brevity.

[15] XLV, p. 82; "Der von Lily verfasste syntaktische Teil stellt eine stark gekürzte auszügliche Übersetzung des von Lily verfassten, von Erasmus überarbeiteten *Absolutissimus* dar, wie er im 16. Jahrhundert meist als Anhang zur Formenlehre des kleinen Donat gedruckt wurde. Ähnlich wie diese Büchlein Lilys ist übrigens schon die von Varnhagen dem Stanbridge zugeschriebene *Longe Parvula* aufgebaut, die demnach als Quelle für den syntaktischen Teil mit in Betracht kommen dürfte."

The *Longe Parvula*, 1481, is a revised and augmented edition of the *Pervula*, almost certainly printed before the *Longe Parvula*, although in the same year. A third edition, likewise revised and augmented, appeared later with the title *Parvulorum Institutio*. At least the first two of these grammars are, in all probability, the work of John Stanbridge, an usher at Magdalen when Lily studied there. See Hermann Varnhagen. *De Duobus Foliis Libri Cuiusdam Anglici Adhuc Ignoti Exeunte Saeculo Quinto Decimo Typis Excusi Quae in Museo Brittanico Asservantur*, Erlangen, 1906, pp. 4, 15; Wilhelm Gräder, ed. *Parvulorum Institutio ex Stanbrigiana Collectione*, Erlangen, 1912, p. 9.

[16] In his *Fifteenth Century English Books*, 1917 (No. 373), E. Gordon Duff gives these words as the *incipit* of a copy of Stanbridge's *Vocabula*. Actually the book he is describing (now in the Pepysian Library) is not the *Vocabula*, but another edition of the *Longe Parvula*, hitherto unrecorded. Duff has been followed in this error by the *Short-Title Catalogue* (No. 23177), and by Foster Watson, p. 233. See my letter to the London *Times Literary Supplement*, December 9, 1939, p. 717.

It seems likely that Lily used the *Pervula,* which alone of the series has the three concords set out together as Lily has them. In other instances the language seems rather to resemble more closely that of one of the others; the first part, for example, is in some ways more like the *Institutio Parvulorum;* in discussing the case of the relative the order in the *Rudimenta* differs from that of all the others, but the language approximates more closely to that of the *Institutio Parvulorum* and the *Longe Parvula* than to that of the *Pervula.* What we know of the dates will not be of great help to us. Certainly the *Pervula* and the *Longe Parvula* were composed before Lily wrote, and possibly the *Institutio Parvulorum.* The earliest known edition of the latter is 1520 (cf. Gräder, p. 9); but there is no reason why it could not have been in existence fifteen years earlier. As for the *Rudimenta,* we are uncertain as to when Lily put it together, although all the evidence points to an early date. The earliest known edition (a small quarto, of which the only surviving copy is in the Bodleian—it is not recorded in *STC*) came from the press of Wynkyn de Worde. An examination of the type suggests a probable date of cir. 1509. (Plimpton's guess of 1512 or 1513 for an edition by Treveris of which he owned a copy is, I think—likewise on typographical grounds—fifteen years too early.)[17]

Whatever Lily took from the Stanbridge grammars, it must not be lost sight of that he made important changes in his sources. The *Pervula* and the *Longe Parvula,* after explaining the rules in English prose, put them into Latin verse for memorizing.[18] Lily has done away with the verses. The *Institutio Parvulorum* has a

[17] George A. Plimpton. *The Education of Shakespeare,* London and New York, 1933, p. 87. For aid in arriving at these conclusions I am indebted to Mr. William A. Jackson.

[18] It is instructive to reflect that the use of verse begun by the mediaeval grammarians was continued by many of their Renaissance successors, notably by Antonio Mancinelli, in his *Spica Quatuor Voluminum,* Venice, 1491; Despauterius, or Ian van Pauteren, author of a whole series of grammatical poems designed to replace the work of Alexander de Villa Dei; and John Anwykyll, author of the *Compendium Totius Grammatice,* Oxford, 1483, probably one of Lily's teachers at Magdalen.

good many long examples from the classics; the *Rudimenta*, like the *Pervula* and *Longe Parvula*, has short and simple ones. Lily has abandoned the catechetical method, although he keeps the personal tone—"I shall reherse it." But chiefly Lily has simplified the grammar: he does not assume, as did his predecessors, that the student knows what a verb is; he tells him, and illustrates his statements with examples easily understood. And when he gets to the dative case, before giving rules for its use, he gives the boy some elementary idea of what his words mean: "The datyue case answereth to this question: to whome? or to what? so that include no mouynge, as I agree to the: *Assentior tibi.* A greuous thynge to me: *Mihi molestum.*"[19]

Dr. Blach's other statement, that the *Rudimenta* is a translation, though much shortened, of the *Libellus*,[20] seems to me wholly lacking support. There are, of course, a few expressions and a few examples which any man composing the two would find it easier to repeat than not. But the differences are so great and the similarities so few that no one—I venture to say—from a mere comparison of the texts, would suspect identity of authorship. The arrangement and the whole method of approach are different. Instead of the crude plan of the *Rudimenta*—preliminary notions, the concords, and the oblique cases—we have here a neater, more compact, more orderly treatment of the different parts of speech, beginning with the verb and ending with the preposition. Substantially it is the order of Donatus, Perottus, and Sulpitius. The method of the *Rudimenta* is simpler, designed for students who actually do not know the rudiments. Its character is reflected in the language employed; the *Libellus*, for example, begins thus: "Omne uerbum antecedit nominatiuus agentis se patientis eiusdem numeri, & personae, ut. Ego doleo, Tu gaudes." The verb is not defined, nor the nominative; there are no directions for finding either; nothing is said about the first concord, although the

[19] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XLV, p. 68.

[20] See above, p. 92, and n. 15; below, pp. 98-101.

thing itself is there. Compare this succinct, packed style with the more diffuse, elementary language of the *Rudimenta.* The section on the nominative case reads as follows:

> Somtyme the nomynatyue case [cometh] after the verbe or after the sygne of the verbe, as in reasons interrogatyues, optatiues, and in reasons hauynge it or there, with such other before the verbe, as thus: Cometht[*sic*] the kynge? or dothe the kynge come? *Venit ne rex?* Gowe or let vs go: *Eamus.* There standeth a man in the dore: *Stat quidam apud ostium.* It is my brother: *Est frater meus.*[21]

Obviously the two texts were composed for different kinds of students. We know that Lily was responsible for both; but to say that either is a translation of the other is reading similarities into the little books that are not there.

The Grammar of Colet and Lily was given a new lease on life by the grace of Cardinal Wolsey, who admired it to such an extent that he took it over for the use of his scholars at Ipswich; the title of one of the two copies in the British Museum is as follows: *Rudimenta Grammatices et Docendi Methodus, Non Tam Scholae Gypsuichianae per Reuerendissimum. D. Thomam Cardinalem Eboraconsem. Feliciter Institutae, quam Omnibus Aliis Totius Anglie Scholis Prescripta.* London: Peter Treueris, 1529. 4°.[22]

But Wolsey did more than give the book a new title and the approval of his high name; he added some prefatory material not unworthy of the former *informator* of Magdalen Grammar School.[23] First comes an introductory verse in Latin, "Ad Lectorem." Then we get the inevitable preface, directed to the masters of Ipswich School, in which His Eminence points out that a

[21] *Shakespeare Jahrbuch,* XLV, p. 57.

[22] The title of the other is the same, but the edition is different; the second book came from the press of Martin Caesar at Antwerp, in 1535.

[23] The remark of Foster Watson in *The English Grammar Schools to 1660,* Cambridge, 1908, p. 250, that this grammar "is founded on Colet's" is of course inadequate and misleading. The same may be said of a statement by Fuller's mortal enemy, Peter Heylyn, in *Ecclesia Restaurata,* ed. J. C. Robertson, Cambridge, 1849, I, p. 74, "where Wolsey is said to have contributed to William Lily's Latin grammar, which was issued with Henry VIII's approval and imposed upon all schools by Edward VI's 'injunctions' of 1547."—A. F. Pollard. *Wolsey,* London and New York, 1929, p. 337, n. 3. Wolsey's contributions were not retained in the editions of 1540 and after.

school is useless without teachers, two of whom have been appointed to teach morals and literature to the youth in their charge, the hope of the commonwealth; that to enable these teachers to perform their duties he is providing textbooks, and a treatise on the method and theory of teaching, as well. This is followed by a two-page[24] discussion of the question, "quo ordine pueri in nostrum gymnasium admissi docendi sint, quique authores eiisdem [*sic*] prelegendi." Next we are given specific directions for teaching the eight classes into which the boys are divided; though comprehensive, these directions have the merit of brevity—they occupy only three pages. In the Treveris edition the text of the grammar, identical at least in order with that of the 1527 edition, follows immediately; but in the Antwerp edition we have justice done to the original compilers in the form of another title-page, bearing the familiar *Ioannis Coleti Theologi, Olim Decani Divi Pauli, Aeditio, una cum Quibusdam G. Lilij Grammatices Rudimenta,* inserted between the new and the old material. The Antwerp edition likewise added two other sections, "De Nominibus Heteroclitis" and "Regulae Versificales," besides a Greek and a Latin vocabulary.

There is one point of considerable interest in the history of the Wolsey grammar which is not, unfortunately, altogether clear. Apparently the significance of the title escaped Lupton; at least he does not mention it. We are told that the book was prescribed for use in all the schools of England: ". . . non tam scholae Gypsuichianae . . . institutae, quam omnibus aliis totius Anglie scholis prescripta." Watson observes that it "was intended not only for Ipswich, and its masters, but as a model for the organized education of 'British youth.' "[25] But the language of the title implies much more than this—it was "prescribed," not merely offered as a model that might be followed at the teacher's choice. It would be extremely interesting to know precisely what

[24] In the quarto edition.

[25] P. 250.

this means. Fuller says that Henry had determined as early as 1519 to introduce uniformity into the teaching of grammar;[26] but he offers no evidence. However, he does refer to a regulation on this subject adopted by the Convocation of Canterbury on March 8, 1530:

> Octavo die Martii (sess. LIII) de reformatione scholarum grammaticalium actum fuit: quia "multiplex et varius in scholis grammaticalibus modus est docendi grammaticam, visum fuit necessarium, quod una et eadem edatur formula auctoritate hujus sacrae synodi, in qualibet et singula schola grammaticali per Cant. provinciam usitanda et edocenda."—David Wilkins, *Concilia,* London, 1737, III, pp. 725-726.

When we consider the date of what is probably the first edition—June 4, 1529 (that of the preface is August 1, 1528)—we can sense the connection: obviously there was a movement on foot to regularize instruction, and "Wolsey's grammar" was chosen as a text. But we are ignorant of further details; and it is unlikely that the falling Chancellor had much time to spend on such matters as grammar. Things were coming to a head for Wolsey. By the time that Treveris was able to display the book, with the Cardinal's arms on the title-page, the papal legate, Campeggio, was opening the trial of the King's marriage. In July the court was prorogued; Pope Clement recalled the case to Rome; almost simultaneously the Emperor and Francis were signing the Peace of Cambrai—the blow "which wrecked Wolsey's foreign policy."[27] The mighty chancellor was ruined; he had failed his master at home and abroad. In October he was deprived of the seals of his office. Another month, and he was within a year from the day when he should be arrested for treason and shortly afterwards die.

Thus a little more than two years from the day on which he wrote the preface Wolsey was no more; and his school at Ipswich had been dissolved.[28] Did he have time to see to it that his

[26] Thomas Fuller. *An Appeal of Injured Innocence,* London, 1659, p. 455.

[27] R. W. Chambers. *Thomas More,* London and New York, 1935, p. 232.

[28] James Gairdner, in his article on Wolsey in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* puts this in the early summer of 1530.

grammar was adopted by all the schools of England? It seems quite unlikely, both from the scarcity of extant copies,[29] and from the shortness of the time between the first edition and his death —a period when, we may presume, he had more to think about than the Latinity of English youth.

Whatever be the truth of the matter, a decade after Wolsey put out his text an official grammar was appointed to replace that and all others. King Henry issued a book based in part on the one that Wolsey had adopted, with a preface which declared in unmistakable terms the royal command that it be used exclusively throughout England.[30] This was a typical Tudor measure; as Watson says, after printing was invented "there was no way of asserting the Royal Supremacy more effectively than by the issue of authoritative books for public and private use."[31] (In this connection, too, Watson points out that the authorized grammar of 1540 preceded the issuance of the authorized Book of Common Prayer, which appeared first in 1549, with a preface which gave reasons for its compilation similar to those given for composing the grammar.) But it is interesting to find indications of authorized editions ten years before Henry's grammar appeared. One wonders if the idea did not originate with the unhappy Cardinal who initiated so much and accomplished so little; if it did it is ironic in the extreme that this, of all his projects, should have been the one to be carried on most successfully after his death.

Libellus de Constructione Octo Partium Orationis

The *Libellus* is a syntax in Latin, which takes up about twenty leaves in the beautiful quartos, with their generous margins and their large print, which were not considered too fine for mere grammars by the best printing houses in sixteenth-century Eu-

[29] It must be remembered, however, that of all books it is textbooks which are least likely to survive: more than any others they run the risk of being "literally thumbed out of existence."

[30] See below, p. 104.

[31] P. 260. Cf. p. 252.

rope. The authorship of the book has not been altogether easy to determine: a preface by Colet to the first edition, which issued from the press of Pynson in 1513, seems to say that Colet wrote it; a great many editions which subsequently appeared on the Continent bore the name of Erasmus; but a preface by Erasmus which appeared in some of the editions of 1515, and in many of the later ones, says that Lily wrote the grammar at Colet's request; that Colet then handed it over to Erasmus for emendation; that the latter emended it by changing many things. Without going into the details of the argument, we may say that this is substantially the view accepted by scholars to-day.[32]

The *Libellus* was printed in both octavo and quarto all over Europe, in a multitude of editions, till near the end of the sixteenth century. Although various titles have been used, the substance of the text never varies—in matters of importance—in any of the copies I have examined.[33] The reason for the popularity of the book is not hard to see, when one compares it with other available texts of the time. As has already been noted (see above pp. 94-95), the book was for those who had passed the elementary stage; it would not compete with such a text as, for example, the Colet-Lily Grammar. But it was infinitely simpler and much shorter than either the grammar of Perottus or of Sulpitius; it had no verses to memorize, no questions to waste space; it had a

[32] The book is catalogued under Lily's name in the chief libraries of England, although some of the great continental libraries (including the Vatican, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the National-Bibliothek of Vienna) still list it under the name of Erasmus. But I am assured by Professor Alphonse Roersch, one of the editors of the *Bibliographica Belgica*, that the project once entertained of including the grammar among the books of Erasmus has been abandoned.

[33] I have collected notices of almost two hundred editions, ranging in time from 1513 to 1595, and in space from Venice to Cracow, but I have not nearly covered the field. Lupton says (*Dictionary of National Biography*, art. "Lily, William") that Lily has been accused by a writer in the *Monthly Review*, I, 1747, p. 28 (an error for the *Universal Magazine*, I, 1747, p. 28, which has been cleverly traced as the source of the statement by Miss Gertrude Chalmers of the University of Chicago Libraries), of taking over the *Libellus* from a work with a similar title by Leonicenus Omnibonus. He has compared the two and found no resemblance whatever; he thinks that the charge arises from the similarity of title. This is quite likely; there are many grammars with titles exactly the same, or nearly so.

sufficiency of examples, without elaborate quotations from the classics. Altogether it must have seemed a rather satisfactory text to the student in the second stage of his grammar training.

A table of contents will make the plan of organization of the *Libellus* clearer:

De Constructione Verbi
- Nominatiuus ante uerbum
- Genitiuus post uerbum
- Datiuus post uerbum
- Accusatiuus post uerbum
- Ablatiuus post uerbum
- Gerundia, gerundiua nomina, supina, de participiis, de nominibus uerbalibus

De Constructione Nominis
- Genitiuus post nomen
- Datiuus post nomen
- Accusatiuus post nomen
- Ablatiuus post nomen

Pronominum Constructio
Aduerbiorum Constructio
Prepositionum Constructio
De Constructione Coniunctionum
De Constructione Interiectionum

The method of the *Libellus* may be seen in the section on the verb. Lily begins by saying that the nominative of the agent or of the person receiving the action precedes the verb; and adds that it agrees with that verb in number and case. He then explains and qualifies this statement with four appendices and two exceptions—the impersonals and the infinitive-accusative. Then he lists, classifies and discusses the verbs that take after them the genitive, the dative, accusative, and ablative. After finishing the verb he treats of those cases in which a noun is followed by another in the genitive, the dative, the accusative, the ablative. The other parts of speech receive, of course, the simpler treatment that their nature demands.

No doubt many instances of similarity, or even identity, of

language could be shown between Lily and earlier grammarians. But these resemblances, I am convinced, are relatively unimportant; whatever use Lily made of the works of others, he certainly improved, in clearness and brevity, upon any of his predecessors with whom we are acquainted.

De Generibus Nominum ac Verborum Praeteritis et Supinis Regulae

Quite independent of the *Rudimenta* and the *Libellus* are two short Latin grammatical poems on accidence which Lily apparently designed as part of a complete series.[34] As we have already noted, in choosing verse for his medium, Lily was following not only the tradition of Evrard and Alexander, but likewise the practice of some of the most respected of the humanist grammarians.[35]

The poems may have been first published by themselves, but the earliest edition I have been able to find is that of 1525—a copy of which is now in the British Museum—revised and augmented by Lily's successor at St. Paul's, his son-in-law John Rightwise, with a vocabulary contributed by the latter. The title runs as follows: *GVILIELMO LILII GRAMMAtici et Poetae Eximij. Paulinae Scholae Olim Moderatioris. De Generibus Nominum. Ac Verborum Praeteritis et Supinis Regulae Pueris Apprime Utiles. Opus Recognitum & Adauctum cum Nominum ac Verborum Interpretamentis. per Ioannem Rituissi* [*sic*] *Scholae Paulinae Praeceptoris.* [Colophon] *Antuerpiae in Rapa, Anno M.D X X V. Mense Iunio.* This would suggest an earlier edition, although it is possible that it was an unpublished text which Rightwise revised. The British Museum Cata-

[34] This is the inference to be drawn from the last line of the *Propria quae maribus* (see below, pp. 38-39).

> Sunt quae deficient genere, adiectiua notanda,
> De quibus atque alijs alibi tibi mentio fiet.

Thomas Robertson, editor of the 1532 Basle edition, comments as follows (fol. F1): "Ex hoc loco apparet Lilium de nominibus *ἑτεροκλίτοις* aut scripsisse quae nondum prodierint, aut habuisse in animo ut scriberet, morte tamen praeuentum non absoluisse." See below, p. 102.

[35] See above, p. 93, n. 18.

logue lists another edition, *s. l. d.*, with the query 1520?, but the date must be too early, as Lily was still flourishing as headmaster in 1520. The title of the book is the same in both editions.

A third edition, finely printed, appeared in 1532; copies of it can be seen to-day in the principal libraries of Europe. The title shows a new editor and new material, and the absence of the former editor's vocabulary: *GVILELMI LILII, OLIM SCHOLAE PAULINAE Apud Londinum Moderatoris, de Latinorum Nominum Generibus, de Verborum Praeteritis & Supinis, Regulae non Minus Utiles, quam Compendiosae, cum Annotationibus THOMAE ROBERTSONI Eboracensis. QUIBUS Accessit de Nominibus Heteroclitis, de Verbis Defectiuis, ac Demum de Versibus Pangendis, Auctarium Neutiquam Poenitendum, per Eundem THOMAM ROBERTSONUM, Appositis Vbique Annotationibus.* [Colophon] *BASILEAE, PER IO. BEBELIVM, ET AND. CRATANDRVM, MENSE AVGVSTO, ANNO M. D. XXXII.*

The new editor, a scholar of distinction, had been master of Magdalen Grammar School since 1526. In the epistle dedicatory he explains why he undertakes to put out a new edition—errors had marred the earlier text, owing no doubt to the premature death of Lily, who had left his work unfinished, and owing also to the haste of the printers who had, as it were, snatched the book from the bier of its author to get it on the stalls. Besides, he wishes to round out the work with sections which Lily had not filled in. He hopes that the book will take its place as the standard accidence, along with the *Libellus* for syntax, and the *Tabula de Schematibus* of Petrus Mosellanus for versification.

The text proper is divided into five sections. Part I, on the genders of nouns, is Lily's *Regulae Generales Propriorum,* of which the first line is the well-known *Propria quae maribus tribuuntur mascula dicas.* Robertson's annotations, in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, are printed on every page beneath the verses; text and commentary occupy seventeen folios. This is followed by a page

and a half to the reader serving as an introduction to the next section; it ends with four Greek verses from Theognis.

Section II consists of Robertson's poem on the heteroclites, with his own annotations, covering ten folios. The opening verse runs:

Quae genus aut flexum uariant, quaecumque nouato.

It was obviously written to match Lily's two poems, the second of which makes up Part III. This is devoted to the preterites of the simple verbs and the supine; it begins with

As in presenti perfectum format in avi.

Like the other two pieces it has its commentary, the whole taking up a trifle over fifteen folios.

Part IV, modestly entitled an *Appendix*, is a much shorter verse treatise on defective verbs, with a few notes—all by Robertson. The text occupies only two and a half leaves.

Next we get another address to the reader, a page and a half in length, ending with an appropriate line (in Greek characters) from Theocritus. Part V keeps up the scholarly tone: it begins with two lines from Callimachus, likewise in Greek. The section is entitled *Compendium Versificationis, seu* ΣΤΙΧΟΛΟΓΙΑ. Like Parts II and IV, it is the work of Robertson, and, though in prose, it has the inevitable accompanying notes. It is over seventeen folios long.

But the work was not destined to be as popular as Lily's Latin syntax; evidently the vogue of Latin grammars in verse was on the wane. In a fairly extensive search I have come upon only five other separate editions, the latest from Cologne in 1555. But most of the text was incorporated in the *Institutio Compendiaria*, the Latin part of the grammar in its final form (see below, p. 104).

I have not considered it within the scope of this study to compare the text with either the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei or the *Grecismus* of Evrard de Bethune; but it should surprise no one to find that Lily borrowed from both. That is what his con-

temporaries would expect; that is precisely how Stanbridge worked.[36]

The Final Form of the Grammar

As we have already seen, a movement was on foot during the lifetime of Cardinal Wolsey to regularize the teaching of grammar.[37] Nothing was to come of this for some time; but about 1540 a new text made its appearance, based on the *Aeditio-Rudimenta*, the *Libellus*, and the *De Generibus Nominum;* it bore a preface which made its use mandatory in the teaching of Latin in England.

Henry the VIII. . . . to all schoolemaisters and teachers of grammar within this his realm greetynge. . . . to the intent that herafter they [English children] may the more readily and easily attein the rudymentes of the latyne toung, without the greate hynderaunce, which heretofore hath been, through the diuersitie of grammers and teachynges: we will and commaunde, and streightly charge al you schoolemaisters and teachers of grammer within this our realme, and other our dominions, as ye intend to auoyde our displeasure, and haue our favour, to teache and learne your scholars this englysshe introduction here ensuing, and the latyne grammer annexed to the same, and none other, which we haue caused for your ease, and your scholars spedy preferment bryefely and playnely to be compyled and set forth. Fayle not to apply your scholars in lernynge and godly education.

This was followed by an address to the fathers of families, the schoolmasters, and the "tender babes" of England, written apparently by the printer. It explains much of the history of the book.

To the reder

. . . And as his maiesty purposeth to establyshe his people in one consent and harmony of pure and tru relygion: so his tender goodnes toward the youth and chyldhode of his realme, entendeth to haue it brought vp vnder one absolute and vniforme sorte of lernynge. For his maiestie consideryng the great encombrance and confusion of the yong and tender wittes, by reason of the diuersity of grammer rules and teachinges. (For here tofore euery maister had his grammer, and euery schole dyuers teachynges, and chaungyng of maisters and scholes dyd many tymes vtterly dull and vndo good wyttes) hath appoynted certein lerned

[36] As Gräder demonstrates, pp. 18-20; and Watson, p. 234.

[37] See above, pp. 95-98.

men mete for such a purpose, to compile one bryef, plaine, and vniforme grammer, which onely (al other set a part) for the more spedynesse, and lesse trouble of yong wittes, his hyghnes hath commanded all scholemaysters and teachers of grammer, within this his realme, and other his dominions, to teache their scholers. . . . And somewhat to declare vnto you the condition and qualitie of this grammer, ye shall vnderstand, that the VIII partes of spech, and the Construction of the same, be not here set forth in engylsshe at large, but compendyously and briefely for the weake capacitie of yong and tender wyttes. And therfore if anythyng semeth here to want in this englyshe Introductions, ye shall vnderstande, it was left out of purpose, and shall be supplied in the latyn rules made for the same intent, whiche chyldren shalbe apte to lerne, what tyme they shall haue competent vnderstandyng by these former rudimentes.[38]

The earliest known edition of the new text is that represented by the handsome quarto on vellum now in the British Museum (*S. T. C.* 15605). The grammar proper is preceded by one gathering (four leaves) taken up with the alphabet and a "catechism" in both Latin and English. It differs considerably from Colet's catechism: the sections on charity and the seven sacraments are left out, as well as the *Oratiuncula ad puerum Iesum;* the "preceptes of lyvynge" are transferred, much altered, but with a Latin translation, to the body of the book, under the title "Godly lessons for Chyldren"; the ten commandments and two new prayers are put in their stead. In fact all that is left is the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Creed, the Commandments, the summary of the Commandments in Matthew 22: 37-40, the "golden rule" (from Matthew 7: 12), a verse from 1 James 1: 17, and the two new prayers—all in both Latin and English except the two verses from St. Matthew, which appear in English alone.[39]

[38] Both prefaces are reprinted in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* XLV, 1909, pp. 85-86.

[39] Lupton, *Notes and Queries,* VI series, II, 1880, 461, says "taking also into account the alterations in the religious rudiments prefixed, we might fairly call the Grammar, in this its second stage [beginning c. 1540], an important document of state closely connected with the Reformation." But there is nothing in the "religious rudiments" of the 1540 edition which could be said to savor of the Reformation, except possibly the enumeration of the commandments, which is that of modern English Protestantism, but which could hardly at that time have been distinctive—the numbering found to-day in Catholic Bibles was not determined until the Council of Trent. And, so far as we can tell from the fragment of the 1548 edition that survives, there was nothing particularly Protestant about that issue: as a matter of fact,

As both prefaces indicate, there are two parts to the new text, one an elementary manual for beginners, in English, the other a more complete treatise in Latin. Each section has its own title, although the two were commonly printed and bound together throughout their long and varied history.

The English part is called *An Introduction of the Eyght Partes of Speche, and the Construction of the Same, Compiled and Sette Forthe by the Comaundement of Our Most Gracious Soverayne Lorde the King.* It consists of an accidence, based on Colet's *Aeditio,* and a syntax based on Lily's *Rudimenta* and his *Libellus;* it includes Lily's famous *Carmen de Moribus.*[40]

The Latin section follows, with a title that modestly disclaims all pretense at completeness, while boldly vindicating its high authority: *Institutio Compendiaria Totius Grammaticae, Quam Et Eruditissimus Atque Idem Illustrissimus Rex Noster Hoc Nomine Euulgari Iussit. ut non Alia Quam haec Una per Totam Angliam Pueris Praelegeretur.* The colophon runs: *Londini, Ex Officina Thomae Bertheleti Typis Impres. Cum Privilegio Ad Imprimendum Solum. Anno Verbi Incarnati.* M. D. XL.

It is to be noted that the date of the *Institutio* is 1540, both on the title-page and in the colophon.[41] But that of *An Introduction* is 1542, while the little catechism has still another date, 1543.

The situation is not altogether clear. The English *Introduction,* dated 1542, speaks twice (in the two prefaces) of the Latin part. But we have a copy of the Latin part dated 1540. This might suggest, since in later editions both parts are usually found together,[42] that the English part was likewise in print by 1540. How-

there is nothing of a religious nature on the four leaves at Lambeth—except one prayer to which any Christian might whole-heartedly have subscribed.

[40] See above, p. 90, n. 11.

[41] The *Short-Title Catalogue* does not list this edition of the *Institutio* at all; it treats the British Museum copy as part of *An Introduction,* the date of which is given as 1542-43 (No. 15605).

[42] An exception appears to be the Britwell copy (now at the Huntington Library) of the *Institutio* of 1543, which seems to have no extant counterpart except the *An Introduction* of 1544, likewise purchased by Huntington from the Britwell Court collection.

ever, this conclusion is not inescapable: even though *An Introduction*, being a book for beginners, naturally preceded the *Institutio Compendiaria* in use, and is for this reason bound up before its Latin counterpart in the Museum copy we are discussing, as well as in all subsequent volumes, nevertheless it need not have been written first. The two sections show a remarkable similarity; the Latin is indeed longer than the English treatise, but not so much longer as one would be led by the prefaces to believe. As a matter of fact, the suspicion presents itself that both were not in the original plan—that whichever part was composed first, it was more or less as an afterthought that the other was drawn up, and that quite clearly on the basis of the one already completed. Hence it may well be that the *Institutio Compendiaria* was published first; and that when it was felt too difficult for tender wits, *An Introduction* was provided as more suitable.

This position is strengthened, I think, by the evidence of the one other remaining copy of the 1540 *Institutio Compendiaria*. The book is (or was) in Lambeth Palace library. On one of the preliminary pages appears the device of Prince Edward, gorgeously painted in by hand.[43] Now this has led to the altogether likely supposition that we have here the copy made expressly for His Highness; the corresponding page in the Museum copy is blank. Could it not be that the *Institutio Compendiaria* was first printed in 1540, the first copy of the edition being given to the boy? Nothing would please Henry more. What did it matter if the three-year old pupil was hardly ready for it? He could wait. In any event the appropriate thing would be to give him the first book

[43] Cf. S. R. Maitland. *A List of Some of the Early Printed Books in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, London, 1843, pp. 386-387, who gives a detailed description of the page on which the "illumination" occurs: "Blank, as it regards printing; but nearly covered by an illumination, consisting of a frame almost 5½ inches high by about 4 inches in width, containing a circle of about 2 inches diameter, with large golden rays issuing from its circumference. In the interior of this circle are the Prince of Wales's feathers passing through a coronet, and with their label and motto beneath. The ground of this interior is party per pale azure and gules, and in the space on the dexter side is a golden E, while in the corresponding space on the other side is a similar P."

that Berthelet could get ready. Of course a copy of *An Introduction* dated 1540 may some day turn up, likewise bearing the arms of Edward. But until it does I believe that we may not unreasonably suppose that when the Latin section was published, either Henry himself or the compilers decided that even the precocious mind of young Edward would do well to begin with an English introduction. In any case, that the latter part as well as the former was intended for the use of the prince is indicated by line 231 of *An Introduction:* whereas in later editions we read, "*Joannes* is my propre name," here we have *Eduardus.*

Maitland has described the *Institutio Compendiaria* in his catalogue of the library at Lambeth.[44] It begins with an address to all the schoolmasters of the realm: *Totius Angliae Ludimagistris;* and another to the reader. Then comes Edward's device.

The text is divided into four unequal sections, preceded by a definition of grammar and a statement of its divisions, which divisions, in fact if not in exact wording, go back to Priscian. The four parts may be schematized as follows:

I. *De Orthographia.* (*Est recte scribendi ratio.*)
De literis.
De syllabarum distinctionibus.
De orthopoeia. (*Est emendate recteque loquendi ratio.*)
De sententiarum punctis.
This material, which takes up only a few pages, is not in the Colet-Lily grammar; it is quite mediaeval in origin.

II. *De Etymologia.* Here we learn that "etymology" has two meanings—the same two meanings borne by the word *Formenlehre* in modern German:

A. The study which is concerned with investigating the origins of words;

B. The study which is concerned with the inflections of words: *ratio cognoscendi casuum discrimina;* that is to say, ac-

[44] *A List,* pp. 207, 385-392.

cidence. In this book the word will be used in the second sense. The compiler goes through the eight parts of speech. Under the noun we get a treatment of gender; it turns out to be Lily's *Propria*, with a prose comment, and at least one considerable addition. For the heteroclites we find Robertson's *Quae Genus*. For the verb we have Lily's poem *As in Praesenti* (with variations), on the preterites of the simple verbs; followed by Robertson's verses on the defective verbs (with prose comments and some changes in the text.) There is also some other material, which was probably derived from the *Aeditio-Rudimenta*.[45]

III. *Syntaxis. De Constructione Octo Partium Orationis.*
But first we are given a few words about the "three concords" in general, taken from Lily's *Rudimenta*. After this comes the Syntax proper, which bears certain resemblances to the *Libellus*. The section closes with eight pages *De Figuris* —according to Ward, the verbal figures are from Petrus Mosellanus, "tho neither the definitions, nor the examples, are intirely[*sic*] the same with his, and the Figures of construction were borrowed from Gerard Listrius, a learned physician and friend of Erasmus."[46]

IV. *De Prosodia*. First drawn up by Robertson, but since much enlarged.[47]

The only other known editions of the grammar in exactly this stage are a quarto of 1543 recently in the possession of Quaritch,[48] and two octavos, an *Institutio Compendiaria* for 1543, and

[45] I know of no basis for the statement of Miss Mary Beth Stewart in *William Lily's Contribution to Classical Study*, in *The Classical Journal*, XXXIII, 1938, p. 220: "Lily divides his *De Grammatica* into four main heads, of which only the first two are definitely known to be entirely Lily's own work. . . ."

[46] John Ward, in the preface to an edition of the grammar which appeared first about 1732; I quote from the edition of London, 1752. Fol. A3v. See below, p. 112.

[47] Ibid.

[48] See Bernard Quaritch. *A Catalogue of Rare and Valuable Early Schoolbooks* [No. 464], London, 1932, pp. 40-41. The title-page of the *Institutio Compendiaria* is reproduced, full size.

An Introduction for 1544 mentioned in *The Britwell Handlist*.[49] All were published by Berthelet.

The next extant edition carries a different title, the title that the grammar has borne throughout most of its career: *A Shorte Introduction of Grammar, Generally to be Used in the Kynges Maiesties Dominions, for the Bryngynge up of all Those that Entende to Atteyne the Knowledge of the Latin Tongue.* An. Domini 1548.[50] The book, which is a quarto, survives in only one fragment of four leaves now at Lambeth.[51] It carries a preface written in the name of the ten-year old king, much like the one by his father; it mentions that the printer was Reginald Wolf. A second preface replaces Berthelet's; its opening words, "To exhort every man to the learning of Grammar. . . ." became familiar to every user of the book from then until the nineteenth century; full of advice on the way to study, it was adopted as the standard preface, and was hardly ever left out of an edition.

The book continued to be printed (though not, it would seem, very frequently)[52] until 1574, when the first of the familiar octavos appeared. Minor changes are found in this edition,[53] which was printed by Francis Flower (or Flowar) "to whom was granted for life the 'privilege' for printing the Grammar, Dec. 15, 1573."[54] But Flower soon turned his privilege into cash. A year from the following Christmas he transferred his right to six "assigns," who paid him a yearly rent of a hundred pounds.[55]

[49] [Sydney R. C. Miller]. *The Britwell Handlist*, London, 1933, II, p. 590. The two octavos are now in the Huntington Library.

[50] This, the title of the English section, gave its name to the whole book, although the separate title-page for the Latin part was retained until revision had altered the work rather thoroughly.

[51] See description in Maitland, pp. 426-427.

[52] I have found (in a search limited to a score of the leading European and American libraries, besides a few lesser ones) only six editions, three of them continental, between those of 1548 and 1574. A copy of the 1574 edition is in the Bodleian.

[53] Lupton (DNB, art. "Lily, William") is misleading when he remarks that "by 1574 the work was issued . . . with a fresh title." As a matter of fact the fresh title dates from the edition of 1548.

[54] Watson, p. 255. [55] Ibid.

From this we can judge how valuable a piece of property the Grammar had become.

"Lily's Grammar" was now on its way, literally, to fame and fortune. It would soon be in the hands of Shakespeare, and in the hands of almost every other English boy who would learn Latin, for many years to come. No count has ever been made of the many editions the book enjoyed during its long life; but Watson points out that during Elizabeth's reign, when 1250 copies of a book constituted an ordinary "edition," 10,000 copies of the Grammar were allowed to be printed annually.[56] I myself have seen almost a hundred different editions which appeared in the two centuries following Elizabeth's death; and I have by no means made a thorough search. This gives some evidence of the enormous circulation of the Grammar.

Lily's Grammar continued to receive official recognition of its unique position. The Injunctions of Edward VI for December 2, 1547, followed by those of Queen Elizabeth for 1559, repeated the commands of their departed father. Nor was ecclesiastical approbation lacking: the Canons Ecclesiastical of 1571 endorsed the Injunction of King Edward, and those of 1604 reiterated the endorsement in Article 79.[57] As Watson observes, this "establishes the authorization of Lily's Grammar (it is to be presumed) down to our own days."[58] It should not be overlooked that this monopoly did not go without opposition: several attacks were made upon it, the last in 1675, when a bill was introduced into the House of Lords to take from Lily's Grammar its official status. After a first reading, however, the bill was dropped. Actually, of course, by this time many "unauthorized" grammars were in the field; but officially Lily's still held its place, as, apparently, it holds its place to-day.

[56] P. 255.

[57] That the law was enforced is indicated by the presence in the episcopal articles of visitation of questions concerning the use of the Grammar, from the time of Cranmer down to that of Bishop Juxon (1640). See Watson, pp. 258-259.

[58] P. 258.

Even after the edition of 1574 changes appear in the text. In 1732, Dr. John Ward, one of the Gresham professors, overhauled the book to the best of his ability. According to Nichols, he "was employed by the booksellers, who were patentees for printing Lily's *Grammar* of the Latin tongue, to give a correct edition of it, purged of the numerous errors which had crept into all the former."[59] The preface which Ward wrote on this occasion is one of the principal sources for our knowledge of the early history of the Grammar.

A few years later another change was made in the book. About 1758 it was "transformed and appropriated" by Eton College, and became known as the Eton Latin Grammar.[60] Such it remained until the headmastership of Dr. Hornby (1868).

The latest revised edition I have been able to find appeared just ten years before the fateful advent of the new head at Eton. This time the work was recast by Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, the less famous brother of the poet; but now it was published under the auspices of Colet's old school, and reclaimed for the use of the boys of Paul's. The title runs as follows: *Rudimenta Grammatices A Johanne Coleto Decano Ecclesiae D. Pauli in Usum Scholae Ab Ipso Institutae. Editio Nova. Londini, Apud Joannem Murray*, 1858.[61] There is a copy at St. Paul's. Though the title is wanting in accuracy, a prefatory epistle admits the share of Erasmus and Lily in the work. This preface, from the scholarly pen of Dr. Herbert Kynaston, Lily's successor in the high mastership, speaks with feeling of the first great Paulines:

Ad Paulinos

Habetis, Pueri, Grammatices libellum a J. Coleto, G. Lilio, D. Erasmo in usum Scholae nostrae excogitatum olim, et in omni parte, ut temporibus illis, absolutum, nunc demum, recudente C. Wordsworth S. T. P. Gymnasii Har-

[59] John Nichols. *Literary Anecdotes*, London, 1812, V, p. 520.

[60] Lupton, in *Notes and Queries*, VI series, II, p. 462, and *DNB* art. "Lily, William."

[61] Re-issues of earlier editions continued to appear, however. The latest I have seen is dated London, 1862, and claims to be the sixteenth edition of its particular type. A copy is in the library of the University of California at Berkeley.

roviensis haud ita pridem Informatore dignissimo, ad accuratioris cujusdam disciplinae exemplar adauctum, accomodatum. Decrevi tamen, consentientibus Procuratoribus nostris, Coleti, Lilii, Erasmi prefationes quasdam apponere, eo potissimum consilio, ut Virorum optimorum beneficia, obsolescentia jam ac prope vetustate obruta, intra hos saltem parietes, ab oblivione hominum et silentio numquam non religiose vindicemus.

H. Kynaston,
D. P. S. Mag. Primarius.

The services of Colet, Lily, and Erasmus, to St. Paul's are not forgotten, even outside her walls; but the grammar they all had a share in compiling has been finally displaced—even though it is still the only authorized grammar in England.

Dr. Kynaston had struck a lofty note; he could hardly have realized that he had sung the swan song of Lily's Grammar.

What Is a Facsimile?*

Facsimile: "An exact copy."—Webster's Dictionary; Oxford Dictionary.

By Frank Weitenkampf

IN these times of photography and photomechanical processes the term "facsimile" may be employed with more right than in the preceding period. In the days, say, before 1870, the use of the word had often no justification whatever. Yet the faithfulness of copies was quite usually emphasized in those times, and that in the face of results which, in the language of Little Buttercup, in *Pinafore*, are "seldom what they seem." Of course, in that period, without our present-day facilities for such work, they may easily have used the word facsimile in good faith, but certainly not with understanding.

Facsimiles began to be made in the eighteenth century. What they did, under the name of facsimile, in the nineteenth century, is almost unbelievable.

Theodore L. De Vinne once said that

> Facsimiles of early type, as made by the bibliographers of the eighteenth century or later, are often unsatisfactory. They usually . . . have been traced by hand on transparent paper and transferred to blocks of wood and plates of copper. The competent engravers of these tracings have not always been happy in making acceptable counterfeits. The reader has had to wait for the combination of photography with chemical engraving before a printing surface could be produced that would be fairly satisfactory. Facsimiles of early type drawn and engraved by hand and printed on [should, of course, be from] stone or copper lack many of the typographical mannerisms that can be produced only from a printing surface in relief.[1]

* Read at the Society's meeting held in New York City, January 16, 1943.

[1] De Vinne, T. L. *Notable Printers of Italy during the Fifteenth Century* . . . New York, 1910.

De Vinne's statement, applicable to illustrations as well as text, puts the whole story in a nutshell. It needs only a little amplification and the citation of some "horrible examples."

In all copies made before the use of the camera, the personality, the mannerisms, the tricks of the trade of the copyist, came between the beholder and the original, changing the character of the latter.

There have been copies made by hand, such as the *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*, done with the pen, both text and illustrations, by Jacques Fucien Leclabart in the eighteenth century. Leclabart described himself as "Membre de l'Académie Royale d'Écriture de Paris. Écrivain imitateur de caractères de toutes les impressions modernes." The job may have been conscientiously done, but one wonders regarding the calligrapher's ability to render the cuts. In the nineteenth-century copy made by H. Bishop, with the pen on vellum, of *La Lettera dell isole che ha trouato nuovamente il re di Spagna*, Florence, 1493, good as it is, even a cursory examination discloses differences in the letters, e.g., the a.

The reprint was an obvious method in the old days. In such productions the text was sometimes re-set from type matching the old as closely as might be, or from type newly cut, sometimes copied by tracings engraved on wood; the old woodcut illustrations were copied and re-engraved on wood in a manner which might easily have something of the hit-or-miss. As examples of such reprints, take the issue of Caxton's *Game of Chesse*, by Vincent Figgins, 1855, done with newly cut type, or Berjeau's edition of the blockbook *History of the Holy Cross*, done from tracings, and apparently engraved on wood. The acceptance of such work seems to show that even in bibliographical circles too much may have been taken uncritically for granted. To see the difference between such productions and the best of to-day, compare them with the facsimile, based on the initial action of the camera, of an edition of the *Canticum Canticorum*, issued by the Marées-

Gesellschaft in 1922. There are also the reprints, in modern type, of the Berners book of Saint Albans, 1810, Caxton's *Morale Prouerbes by Cristyne de Pisan,* 1859, and *The Knightly Tale of Golagrus and Gawane,* 1827. Only the last is called, in its introduction, a "*facsimile* reprint"—which, of course, it is not. The same is true of *Gouvernayle of Helthe . . . Reprinted from Caxton's Edition. With Notes by William Blades,* 1858, in which "an effort has been made, by the use of Types very similar to those employed by Caxton, to give this Reprint something of the Appearance of the Original." In other words, a surrogate! The statement continues: "To effect this still further, the types were cast expressly in Pewter, which, from its softness, yields an Impression resembling more the Production of the early Printers, than could be obtained from a harder Material." (Figgins, in his *Game of Chesse,* already noted, refers to Caxton's probable use of pewter.) But the type is different. However, Blades was honest about it. Of the frontispiece he said: "for a printed facsimile it has probably never been excelled. This is due to the care of Mr. I. F. Tupper, lithographic artist." Again the intervention of some one between us and the original. As to lithography, more of that later. The Blades reprint of Caxton's *Ars Moriendi* was rightly referred to in Nicholson's later photolithographic reproduction of the same book as "not in facsimile"; Nicholson's was. There are many differences in letters between the two. And, to step for a moment into our own days, to the *Epistole et Evangeli,* Florence, 1495, reprinted in 1910 from the unique copy in the possession of C. W. Dyson Perrins, for the Roxburghe Club, we find on the title-page: "reproduced in facsimile with the text." A little ambiguous? But A. W. Pollard's introduction informs us that the book is "here reprinted, with facsimiles of its woodcuts by Emery Walker." Here may be mentioned also *Die hystorie van die seuen wijse mannen van Romen,* Haarlem, 1898, printed from fifteenth-century type. An interesting recent production is Charles B. Brown's *Alcuin,* reissued in what is significantly called "a type-facsimile reprint,"

under the superintendence of Carl P. Rollins, New Haven, 1935. "The type employed," says the introduction, "is apparently the exact font used in the original in 1798." Mr. John Archer and I were unable to compare this with The New York Public Library's original (1798), the latter being unavailable for the duration.

Sometimes, for the cuts, the actual original woodblocks were used. Thus, four of the cuts of Dürer's *Little Passion*, printed from the original blocks, appeared in W. J. Ottley's *Origin and early History of Engraving*, 1816. Later, over thirty stereotypes made from the old blocks were used for Henry Cole's edition (1844) of the same set of prints; Charles Thurston Thompson "re-engraved the injured portions," according to H. C. Levis.[2] The result is often lighter and a bit muddier than in photomechanical reproductions of a later date. The cuts were issued again in 1856, with the note: "allowance being made for the dressing necessary on account of the worm-holes, the prints may be fairly said to represent the original wood-blocks." Well, that's a fair statement. Similarly, in the volume (1922) of restrikes from the old woodblocks in the H. A. von Derschau collection, Max J. Friedländer points out that old blocks naturally warp, a condition which may to a certain extent be overcome by a skillful master of hand printing. Still, in such restrikes we obviously get nearer to the original, even though the effort to reproduce a cut as it appeared in the beginning may lead to some restoration.

When the illustrations in incunabula, and sometimes even the text, were copied by re-drawing or tracing, and the result engraved on copper, steel, or wood, or transferred to the lithographic stone, two people, draughtsman and engraver, stand between us and the original. So much depends on the ability of the copying artist, his conscientiousness, his response to the spirit of the original, his avoidance of his own habitual flourishes. For Caxton's *Game of Chesse* in the Figgins re-issue of 1855 the cuts

[2] *A Descriptive Bibliography of . . . Engraving*, London, 1912, p. 157.

were traced; they were then engraved on wood by Miss Byfield. At all events, the thing was not a facsimile, but an imitation, as Figgins honestly called it. The Byfields, John and Mary, seem to have had a certain reputation as copyists of old woodcuts. Their work is found in some of Dibdin's books and in Holbein's *Dance of Death,* 1833; re-issued 1878. "Fac-similes," wrote Francis Douce, "executed with consummate skill and fidelity by Messrs. Bonner and Byfield. They may very justly be regarded as scarcely distinguishable from the fine originals." Well, they are distinguishable, although they are very decent copies. Editorial self-satisfaction of this kind was common during that period, and later, too. Here's a pretty example of that. In 1859-1860 Ambroise Firmin Didot, of Paris, reprinted Vecellio's noted book on costume (*Habiti antichi,* 1590). The publisher tells us "the moment has come when one can reproduce, on wood, with a wholly new charm, the masterpieces drawn by the great masters of art in the sixteenth century, and engraved." That gives the whole thing away. The old cuts, not too important artistically, were re-drawn and re-engraved, somewhat ploddingly (one seeks in vain for the "wholly new charm"), and set in modern borders of which the publisher was complacently proud, and which are even less interesting than the originals. One recalls Anatole France's *Sylvestre Bonnard* saying: "I opened before her Vecellio's collection of costumes; not, if you please, the banal reproduction so meagerly executed by modern artists, but in truth a magnificent and valuable copy of the editio princeps."

However, there are examples of a very different attitude. In Hugo Bürkner's issue of Holbein's *Old Testament,* 1850, "copied exactly from the originals" on wood, the introduction states that the Byfields made good copies of Holbein, but that Bürkner did better, his work "being able to represent the originals." Bürkner himself is more humble: "As far as possible," writes he, and asks the "forbearance of the public." He continues: "How difficult is

the making of good copies can only be realized by one who himself has tried to produce them, making the strictest demands on himself." On the whole, he preserves the spirit of the original, but little technical tricks and habits of his time slip in to prevent this from being a real facsimile. This is true of practically all such nineteenth-century re-engraving on wood, such as that in Eye and Falke's *Gallery*, 1858, with intrusion of the copperplate manner, and Holbein's *Emblems of Mortality*, copied by J. Bewick, 1789—the latter definitely not facsimiles, but very free copies.

R. Weigel, in presenting his *Altdeutsches Holzschnitt-Alphabet*, published in the 1850's, tells us that

> Mr. Lödel has drawn most of the initials on the block, and Mr. Krüger has engraved them. To reproduce the mastery of the originals would be a masterpiece; if a skillful artist draws the copy ten times on the block, and ten different wood-engravers cut it, the result would be different in each case.

Compare this book with the one on the initials of Hans Holbein, by Gustav Schneeli and Paul Heitz (Strassburg, 1900), and the photo-process illustrations in the latter, though poor, show that the artist and engraver who worked on Weigel's volume were quite in the spirit of their day, reflecting the nineteenth century and not the sixteenth, in their lines and general technique. Weigel is equally apologetic about his *Holzschnitte berühmter Meister*, Leipzig, 1851-1857, although the title-page speaks of "faithful copies." But although here, too, the wood-engraver occasionally makes habitual motions with his burin, the work, particularly in the pieces after Dürer and Holbein, is among the best of its kind. It includes reproductions of chiaroscuro prints, in several colors, which offered special difficulties in those days. Heinrich Lödel made a brave attempt at it in a volume on Johann Wechtlin (1863); the plates, with the usual reservations regarding the expressed personality of the nineteenth-century artist, compare not too unfavorably with such collotypes as those in Reichel's folio on chiaroscuro prints published in 1926. Reichel

himself speaks of the insufficiency of earlier reproductions of such color prints, and the difficulties encountered even in the camera age. One of the most successful attempts to render old woodcuts by re-engraving is found in Dürer's *Little Passion*, 1859, "faithfully re-engraved on wood by C. Deis." These copies are so close as to be almost deceptive at first sight—almost. Make no mistake, however. This work was good for its time, but we would not accept it to-day.

In those mid-century days, and later, too, the amateurish copyist was in evidence. In W. J. Ottley's *Inquiry concerning the Invention of Printing, with Introduction by J. Ph. Berjeau*, 1863, some of the illustrations are unbelievably amateurish. In Thomas Wright's well-known books on caricature (*Caricature History of the Georges*, etc.), details copied separately are re-drawn in a manner that does not hold the lines of the originals at all. The same is true of Grego's *Rowlandson*, 1880, the similar details in which are at best memoranda, with the faintest possible hint of Rowlandson. John Ashton followed the same plan in his *Old Times*, 1885, and other books, the outline drawings in which, amateurishly weak, are "guaranteed" as "faithful reproductions" by the author, since he "drew them all himself." Perhaps that ought to satisfy us, but it doesn't.

So much for copies engraved on wood. Engraving on copper or steel was similarly used, and there again the modern engraver gets between us and the original. There are such line engravings in Dibdin's *Bibliographical Decameron*, 1817, in Ottley's *Inquiry into the Origin . . . of Engraving*, 1816, and other books by Ottley. The advertisement of one of the latter says "Engraved in exact conformity to the original." Always the same self-assurance. The engravings in Ottley's books are halting, and not "fine copies," as H. C. Levis says; one after Zasinger is a pretty example of traduction. And one can easily see what the engravers did to Hogarth in copying his plates, for the various later editions of his works.

A notable example of misplaced encomiums is offered by Bartolozzi's stipple engravings after Holbein's portrait drawings of persons of the court of Henry VIII, first published in 1792 as *Imitations*—which is all they were, at best. They are almost travesties of the drawings. They were reproduced in 1884, seven years after photographic reproductions had already been published, as "the most faithful copies of the originals. The world need not be told what to expect from Bartolozzi." Well, the world was not told. Woltmann, in his *Holbein,* 1876, called these prints "a real facsimile," and A. de Vesme, as late as 1928, in his *Bartolozzi,* joined the chorus of praise. Yet de Vesme could have seen the Arundel Society's autotype reproductions (1877) of Holbein's drawings, giving so much better an idea of the originals, as well as the collotypes, issued about the time of the first World War, in which these drawings were first set properly before us in form and color. It seems worth noting that the preface of the Arundel Society's publication tells us that "the portraits show terrible marks of former careless treatment . . . , and some have been traced through with a sharp point for engraving."

Holbein was ill-treated elsewhere, also. Wenceslaus Hollar, capable etcher of the seventeenth century, fell down when he made copies of the woodcut *Dance of Death* of 1538; "inaccurate," Francis Douce called them, while in the volume of Schlotthauer's lithographic re-drawings (1832) they were praised as "the most celebrated copy." Indeed, Hollar left little of Holbein. His etchings were reprinted several times; for the 1816 edition "it was found requisite that the plates should be retouched, and it has been done with the utmost attention to the preservation of their original spirit and character." And so Hollar got his dose of outside meddling. And then Deuchar outdid Hollar by transposing these Holbein woodcuts into etchings (1803) that are utterly impossible.

The matter of the reproduction of original drawings, such as those by Holbein, just referred to, is an important one. A pat il-

lustration of that is offered by the marginal designs made for the prayer-book of the emperor Maximilian I by Dürer. They were re-drawn on the lithographic stone by Strixner, conscientiously enough, we may believe. From that Munich edition Ackermann of London in 1817 published a "facsimile, copied on STONE," hoping "to produce an English copy equal to the German, which is a perfect facsimile of the original." So the merry game of self-delusion went on. Nearly a century passed before adequate reproductions of these drawings were made by photo-process.

Lithography as a copyist's tool again implied re-drawing. Berjeau's edition of the blockbook *Canticum Canticorum* of 1465 was done from tracings, apparently by lithography. For *The First New Testament printed in the English language*, 1862, tracings were made on transfer paper and transferred to the lithographic stone, "a method," says Francis Fry in his introduction, "evidently calculated to insure the closest possible correspondence with the original." Yes, the "closest possible" at that time and by that method, perhaps; but not "correspondence" from our present-day viewpoint. A different application of lithography was used for *Ars Moriendi. Editio princeps, circa 1450*, issued by the Holbein Society in 1881. The "reproduction was executed in *facsimile* with the pen, by Mr. F. C. Price, and transferred to the stone." So this was really a copy by hand, similar to those considered at the beginning of this paper, save that the pen copy was transferred to the stone. That produced an affair twice removed from the original. The introduction continues:

> As a specimen of *facsimile* art it is a perfect marvel, and shows at once the superiority of this kind of reproduction to the photographic process, as one may see by comparing it with the photographic reproduction of the present work, published by Weigel in 1869.

That proves nothing, as the comparison is hardly a fair one, for Weigel's photographs happen to look washed-out. Even so, there are slight differences between these two reproductions. More-

over, the Holbein Society itself, in its earlier publications, did use the camera in photolithography.

Adam Pilinski was credited with the invention of "a facsimile process (homoegraphie) employed in his lithographic institute," and used for the *Monuments de la xylographie*, Paris, 1882 and after. The introduction to his *Apocalypse* informs us that reproductions

> made by means of photography have rendered brutally, with all the fortuitous deterioration of the model; those due to lithography often lack fidelity. . . . A truly meritorious facsimile must not limit itself to reproducing exactly the lines of the pictures and text . . . , but must approach under all aspects, to the point of suppressing all difference between original and copy.

After all which talk, the later photomechanical re-issues of this blockbook by Kristeller and others make it fairly apparent that Pilinski's method implied re-drawing; at all events, there are various little differences between his and the other reproductions. (In The New York Public Library's copy of Pilinski's *Ars Memorandi* a type-written sheet calls attention to "variations in the reproductions of Schreiber and Pilinski, and the Library's original.") Yet Dutuit (*Manuel de l'amateur d'estampes*, 1884) accepted Pilinski's work as "almost perfection in every respect." Pilinski's reticence regarding details of his process is not an isolated instance. An example is found in the *Grande Passion* of Dürer issued in Utrecht in 1875 by means of the "excellent process" of P. W. van de Weijer. He ran a lithographic establishment, and we are told of the years of research that resulted in his discovery, but not a word about its nature. If it was photolithography, as is fairly evident, why not say so?

A word about chromolithography, i.e., lithography printed in color. Curmer, in Paris, in the 'sixties, issued several volumes illustrated by this process. A typical one is *Les Evangiles des dimanches et fêtes*, 1864. A prefatory statement in the book informs us that

one hundred miniatures will accompany the text, and each page will be enclosed in an ornament always new, characterizing the types of the principal epochs of the art of the miniature painter. The text will be printed with the aid of type of the XV. century.

But the type is modern, and the miniatures were apparently copied by hand and transferred to the lithographic stone. Moreover, the above statement shows clearly that this is not a facsimile, nor even a copy, of any one illuminated manuscript or book, but a compilation of a number of color reproductions of miniatures, served up in a sauce drawn from various sources, to give a subscribing public a sort of *édition de luxe* production. The illuminated manuscript has a considerable literature of its own, in a number of volumes offering reproductions, both in black-and-white and in color, done in lithography and the photomechanical processes. Chromolithography was used for J. O. Westwood's *Fac-similes of the Miniatures and Ornaments of Anglo-Saxon and Irish Manuscripts*, 1868, and other books. T. K. Abbott, in his *Celtic Ornaments from the Book of Kells*, 1895, in which he used black-and-white collotype plates—all of them a bit darkish—had this to say:

In the present publication the use of coloured reproductions had to be renounced. . . . None of the attempts hitherto made to reproduce the colours can be called successful (not even Prof. Westwood's, admirable as they are). Indeed, some of the most widely-circulated can only be called caricatures, the softness and harmony being completely absent. . . . But as far as the resources of Photography permit [remember, this was back in 1895] the balance of light and shade has been preserved. . . . Color sensitive (iso- or ortho-chromatic) plates were used. . . . Most of the illustrations have been printed in Collotype . . . ; in a few instances, where the detail is exceptionally delicate, the Woodbury process [also a photomechanical one, defined by S. R. Koehler as an intaglio process] has been employed.

Again and again we come upon such statements, which illustrate the progress of processes, and sometimes also the weakness of human nature. This whole question of illuminated manuscripts calls for separate treatment by an authority.

Photolithography has already been mentioned. It marks the

entrance of the camera upon the scene of our studies. Straight photographs were used for example in T. O. Weigel's *Ars Moriendi*, 1869, *Il Breviario Grimani*, Venice, 1862, and the Pierpont Morgan Library's voluminous *Codices Coptici*, 1922. Autotype (in some cases, carbon photographs) served for the Arundel Society's Holbein drawings issued in 1877 already referred to, the *Liber Studiorum* of J. M. W. Turner, 1899, etc. Stopford Brooke, in the preface of the last-named book, speaks at length of the photographic difficulties in getting the faintest etched lines and the fine gradations of tone. His final decision was to leave the negative untouched. The possibilities in the combination of photography with printing processes seem to have been seized on first by the lithographers. Result: photolithography. The Holbein Society made use of this process for its *Facsimile Reprints*, 1869 et seq. The preface to volume one tells us that photography copied the original with "all its excellencies as well as its defects," and that "it was thought preferable that no restoration should be attempted." After describing the process, the writer informs us that "there are many photo-lithographic processes." (At that early date!) The result is a bit woolly, but marks decided advance in getting closer to the original. Giehlow's facsimile (1907) of the prayer-book of Maximilian I, with drawings by Dürer and Cranach, was done in collotype for the marginal drawings, and photolithography for the letters, lines and tones. Giehlow says that to avoid retouching he used photolithography, and then tells us that the lines in the photographic negative "are so sickly that they are lost even in the etching process," and an expert lithographer "with a sense of form" has to step in to mend matters! (Avoiding retouching?) Under this treatment, says George Leidinger (in his issue of the same prayer book, 1922) "the graphic character of the drawings had undoubtedly suffered." He adds that his color-collotypes avoided all added drawing and "sought to effect that which had not already been brought out by the camera, only by photomechanical measures."

Now, then, we are fully in our own time of the dominance of the photomechanical processes: photo-line-engraving, half-tone, photogravure, collotype, all of which came into use in the eighteen-eighties. For a detailed account of the nature of these various processes, and for consideration of which one is best for each given purpose, I must perforce refer you to your own reading, and perhaps also to a possible later paper to be read before your Society by one thoroughly conversant with the subject.

The entrance of the camera marks a revolution in facsimile making. Results can now be obtained which were impossible before. The use of photomechanical processes has become so widespread, and their products are so voluminous, that it is not necessary to insist on their usefulness and value by giving long lists of successful reproductions that have been published in our day.

However, there is still some need for caution in accepting results, particularly those of the earlier years of these processes. Even some of the later ones may not quite come up to the mark. For example, compare the collotype copy of a plate of the *Chevalier délibéré*, Gouda, 1486, in A. J. J. Delen's *Histoire de la gravure dans les anciens Pays-Bas*, 1921, vol. 1, plate 42, with the reproduction of the Schiedam edition (about 1500) of the same book in the [English] Bibliographical Society's Monographs, vol. 5, 1898. The second, and earlier, one is a little paler, but clearer, with white background; the other has the grayish background often found in such work.

In the reproduction of type, with its clear outline, and of type accompanied by woodcuts with lines standing out in the same separateness, photo-line-engraving (a relief process like that of type and woodcut) has produced some good results, as in Geisberg's book on German separate woodcuts of the sixteenth century, 1923-1926. The preface tells us that whenever possible photo-line-engraving was used, as "it is most just to the relief character of the woodcut." That recalls a remark made to me by Carl P. Rollins, who pointed out that some processes may reproduce

the shape, the silhouette, of type without giving the effect of the impress of type on paper. Bruce Rogers said to me, not long ago, that the photomechanical reproductions that he had seen did not quite reproduce old type such as the Jenson. So much, said he, depends on the way in which they are printed, and on the originals, which latter are usually not black but grayish.

The half-tone, with its screen, is not suited for the reproduction of line work, since the screen cuts up the line into a series of dots. Even for tone-work its use may be questionable, if absolute facsimile is desired. Yet, in the course of a recent luncheon discussion, Bruce Rogers spoke about the excellence and clearness of half-tone pictorial reproductions. On which John Archer, chief of the Printing Office of The New York Public Library, pointed out that examination of two reproductions, one by half-tone and one by collotype, showed that the half-tone seemed clear in details and the collotype a bit fuzzy. But through a magnifying glass it appeared that the collotype details were clear in every line, while those of the half-tone were not. The half-tone, said he, "is an illusion."

Photogravure, an intaglio process, has often been used, as by the International Chalcographical Society (in the eighteen-eighties and 'nineties), in R. T. H. Halsey's *The Boston Port Bill as pictured by a contemporary London Cartoonist*, The Grolier Club, 1904, and Sidney Colvin's *Early Engraving and Engravers in England*, 1905, to name a few. Charles Blanc's *Oeuvre de Rembrandt*, 1873, was illustrated with etched copies of Rembrandt's etchings by Flameng and héliogravures (photogravures) by Amand-Durand. Blanc speaks of

> the marvelous results obtained by héliogravure, [and goes on:] but the héliogravure cannot render everything with equal perfection. When the original print is very black, it may happen that this black . . . becomes flat and dull in photography. To avoid this, we have had recourse to the talent of Flameng. . . . With a sort of genius, he has etched the *Hundred Guilder Print*.

Perhaps one cannot quite see with Blanc in this. The photo-

gravure made after the same print by Amand-Durand for a later publication (1876), and the still later one (1931) issued by Amsler & Ruthardt, show no great difference in the dark shadows, but do show slight changes in faces made by Flameng.

Some of the best results have been achieved with collotype, which is neither relief nor an intaglio process, but a planographic one, as is lithography. Some of the earlier collotypes had a grayish background, as in S. A. Green's *Ten Fac-simile Reproductions relating to old Boston and Neighborhood,* 1901. That did not make for clearness. Later, many noteworthy reproductions were executed in collotype. For example, *The Tickhill Psalter* . . . by Donald G. Egbert, New York Public Library and Princeton University, 1940, in which, besides the black-and-white plates, there is a notable frontispiece in color. In *La Miniature française aux XV^e^ et XVI^e^ siècles,* Paris and Brussels, 1930, the plates are in "héliotype," with a frontispiece in "héliochrome." The latter has a screen, being evidently done by a color process based on halftone. On the other hand, in *La Miniature italienne du X^e^ au XVI^e^ siècle,* by Paolo d'Ancona, Paris and Brussels, 1925, the term "héliochrome" is used for what is apparently collotype, in color; at all events, there is no screen. So much for terminology.

When we learn that in the Gutenberg *Bible,* reproduced in collotype by Albert Frisch, 1913, and in Retza's *Defensorium Immaculatae Virginitatis,* Insel Verlag, 1925, the colors were put on by hand, there naturally arises the question: how does the coloring vary between different copies of this reproduction, and between it and the original?

The fact that in color reproduction the colors are selected not by mechanical means but by the choice of the man making the reproduction was stressed by Prof. Erwin Panofsky, of Princeton University, in his argument against facsimile reproduction of paintings and drawings. This article, published in *Der Kreis,* 1930, was caused by a fierce dispute raging in Germany in 1930

"about the aesthetic and even moral permissibility of mechanical facsimile reproduction," as Prof. Panofsky put it.

Collotype has at times been used to get not only a facsimile of the original, but to reproduce also the adventitious effects, such as spots, discolorations, tears, as in the *Canticum Canticorum,* Marées-Gesellschaft, 1922, in color. The question of such complete rendering of the original, as it was at the time the reproduction was made, is one on which not all the authorities are in agreement. We have seen what Cole in the *Little Passion,* Friedländer in the Derschau restrikes, Giehlow and Leidinger in their facsimiles of the prayer-book of Maximilian I, did to get at the appearance of their models in their primordial state. Geisberg, in his work on early woodcuts already cited, says that

> the principle must be kept in view that all chance conditions, such as discoloring of paper, spots, later additions made by hand . . . , are to be eliminated in the reproduction. . . . The cut is to be shown as the draughtsman conceived it.

And George Watson Cole, in *Documents relating to New Netherland,* Henry E. Huntington Library, 1924, describes the making of the line-cuts "so as to leave a facsimile as exact as possible of the manuscript as originally written by the scribe." On the other hand, the Facsimile Text Society, New York, reproducing by the offset process, announced in its prospectus: "In the case of unique copies no attempt will be made to clean up damaged pages or remove blots, etc." And we remember that the Holbein Society decided to attempt no restoration in its *Facsimile Reprints.*

So there is something to be said on both sides. Take your choice. We have a facsimile, either way. It would be interesting also to learn from our bibliographers how often the size of the margins is shown in facsimiles.

The photostat is familiar to us all, and its use has increased in recent years for very small editions, such as the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Photostat Americana,* issued in ten copies for a group of American libraries. The Modern Language Association has a large collection of photostats.

We see, then, that the camera has helped us greatly in the production of adequate facsimiles.

All of this forms a somewhat sketchy review. There is room for more detailed study and for specialization. Any one interested enough in the subject to go on from here might, for example, compare the various reproductions made—in photolithography, photo-line-engraving, and collotype—of the Columbus Letter. Or study reproductions made, at various periods, of the *Ars Moriendi,* Dürer's *Little Passion,* or Holbein's *Dance of Death.* Or, take up William Blake, and study the color reproductions of his books made by William Muir in the eighteen-eighties, and by others since then. This last offers an interesting bit of research, which will yield such extreme contrasts as the *Works by William Blake,* 1876, of which S. R. Koehler, the sapient print expert, wrote: "These facsimiles are useless, . . . inaccurate," and the *Illustrations of the Book of Job,* done by Emery Walker, Ltd., The Pierpont Morgan Library, 1935.

Enough of all this. By this time it should be fairly apparent that the term "facsimile" has often been far too loosely used for "copies." Every facsimile is a copy, but not every copy is a facsimile. We cannot carry on certain studies with copies that are not "exact."

Some Anonymous and Pseudonymous Thrillers of Louisa M. Alcott

By Leona Rostenberg

WHEN Jo March, dressed in her best, entered the office of the "Weekly Volcano" she found herself confronted by three men "sitting with their heels rather higher than their hats" and smoking long black cigars. Jo had come to offer her latest thriller to the condescending Mr. Dashwood and his partners, the editors of the "Weekly Volcano."

How exactly Louisa M. Alcott has revealed her experiences and tribulations as a writer of sensational fiction in *Little Women* cannot be determined. Nevertheless there is sufficient indication that in reality she had aspired as Jo, had known the counterpart of the critical Mr. Dashwood and his associates and had seen the pages of an authentic "Weekly Volcano" emblazoned with her thrillers.

Although Miss Alcott during the early years of her literary career contributed to the popular *Boston Saturday Evening Gazette* and the proud young *Atlantic Monthly*, she did not disdain publications of lesser repute. By 1862 she wrote regularly for *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, a small folio journal selling at ten cents a copy, replete with alluring pictures, New York gossip, murder trials and ringside bouts. Leslie considered her tales "so dramatic, vivid and full of plot"[1] that he announced her anonymous story, *Pauline's Passion and Punishment*, appearing in Janu-

[1] Ednah D. Cheney, editor. *Louisa May Alcott Her Life, Letters and Journals.* Boston, 1920, p. 131.

ary, 1863, as a prize winner.[2] Her tale, *Enigmas*, was published in the May issues of 1864.[3] In Miss Alcott's opinion this thriller was much liked by readers of "sensation rubbish, but having gotten my fifty dollars I was resigned."[4] By her own admission, however, Louisa Alcott enjoyed writing tales injected with the "lurid" not only because of the lucrative rewards, which she sorely needed, but because of "her passion for wild adventurous life and even melodramatic action."[5] The realization that the publication of her stories in Leslie's paper and others of such character would not enhance her reputation may have induced her "resignation." Despite this attitude *Enigmas* was not to be her last tale of blood and thunder.

Shrouded in pseudonymity, Louisa Alcott's stories appeared during the 'sixties in the Boston penny dreadful, *The Flag of Our Union*. Founded by Fred Gleason in 1842 and later sold to the enterprising Maturin Murray Ballou, this weekly in 1863 passed into the hands of James R. Elliott, William H. Thomes and Newton Talbot, the first two of whom had worked with Henry Leslie for Gleason's publications.[6] Of the three partners the best known is William H. Thomes, author of several successful adventure stories. Originally from Portland, he drifted to Boston

[2] A letter written by Leslie's editor, E. George Squier, is dated December 18, 1862: "My Dear Madame, Your tale 'Pauline' this morning was awarded the $100 prize for the best short tale for Mr. Leslie's newspaper, and you will hear from him in due course in reference to what you may regard as an essential part of the matter. I presume that it will be on hand for those little Christmas purchases. Allow me to congratulate you on your success and to recommend you to submit whatever you may hereafter have of the same sort for Mr. Leslie's acceptance. Truly yr. obdt. servant. E. G. Squier." *Manuscript in Orchard House, Concord, Mass.* Miss Alcott writes in April, 1863: "Received $100 from F. L. for a tale which won the prize last January." Cheney, op. cit., p. 151. *Pauline's Passion and Punishment* appeared in *Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, Vol. XV, nos. 379 & 380, January 3 and 10, 1863.

[3] *Enigmas* by Miss L. M. Alcott in *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, Vol. XVIII, nos. 450 & 451, May 14 & 21, 1864.

[4] Cheney, op. cit., p. 158. The prize was really $100, and not $50.

[5] Ibid., pp. 63 and 105.

[6] Frank Luther Mott. *A History of American Magazines from 1741 to 1885*. New York, 1930-1938, Vol. II, pp. 31, 35, 36, 64, 411.

and took to sea during the early 'forties. Back in Boston and ready for new adventure, he formed the Boston and California Joint Stock Mining Company whose members were "to take their Bibles in one hand and their great New England civilization in the other and conquer all wickedness that stood in their path."[7] Thomes appears to have conquered neither wickedness nor the West, for he was back in Boston in 1857 to become a reporter for the *Herald* until 1860.[8] The following year he associated himself with James R. Elliott as co-publisher of *The American Union* with offices at 100 Washington Street.[9] Prior to his partnership with Thomes, Elliott had published *The True Flag* with W. U. Moulton and M. V. Lincoln.[10] It appears that with the transfer of *The Flag of Our Union* to Elliott and Thomes, Talbot, who had worked as cashier for the Ballou publications, decided to continue his connections and hence became the third partner in 1863.[11]

The firm, located first at 118 Washington Street and later at 63 Congress Street, issued not only *The Flag of Our Union* but other former cheap Ballou periodicals, *The Dollar Monthly*, *The Monthly Novelette* and *The American Union*. Among their contributors were the popular Sylvanus Cobb, Junior, Francis Durivage, Rochester and Amanda Hale whose stories bristled with tales of the South Seas, mulattos, banishment, love and crime. *The Flag of Our Union*, which Gleason claimed had enjoyed a circulation of 100,000 and brought its owner a yearly income of $25,000, had increased from four to sixteen pages under Elliott's management.[12] Although it originally prided itself on containing

[7] For an account of Thomes's Western adventures and literary activity, see George R. Stewart. *Take your Bible in One Hand, The Life of William Henry Thomes*. San Francisco, 1939.

[8] *The Boston Directory*, 1858-1860.

[9] Ibid., 1861.

[10] Ibid., 1858-1860.

[11] Ibid., 1858-1862.

[12] George W. Browne. *Pioneers of "Popular Literature."* In: *Granite State Magazine*, February, 1907, III, no. 2.

no advertisements it now brought to the public's attention the soothing properties of "Redding's Russia Salve" and "Wistar's Balsam." Under the direction of Elliott, Thomes and Talbot the annual subscription rate had risen from two to four dollars annually. It was described by the editors as the "Best Literary Journal" with a corps of contributors embracing "The Best Writers in the Country."

Miss Alcott's contributions to *The Flag*, tales of violence and revenge peopled with convicts and opium addicts, appeared anonymously, and pseudonymously as the products of A. M. Barnard. This name may have been suggested either by fancy or a chain of associations. The A may have been derived from any one of the family names, Amos, Abba or Anna. The M more than likely represented her mother's maiden name, May, likewise Miss Alcott's middle name. Her father claimed Henry Barnard, the Connecticut schoolmaster, as a close friend and the suitability of this surname may have attracted his inspired daughter. Miss Alcott's choice of a pseudonym for her stories to *The Flag* again betrays her own attitude toward the penny dreadfuls and her own thrillers. Although Elliott had written to her that *The Flag* was "a literary paper that none need to blush for, and a credit to contribute to its columns rather than otherwise," Miss Alcott was unwilling to risk a reputation already founded upon *Flower Fables* and *Hospital Sketches*.[13] Since she permitted poems to appear under her own name, it would seem that she did not altogether condemn the periodical but was loathe to link her name with the sensational stories she had contributed. Elliott, however, did not fully share her attitude. He was eager for her stories to appear under her own name but consented to her pseudonym "A. M. Barnard or 'any other man' " with which she wished "to father" her tales as long as she would contribute to his publications.[14]

[13] Letter I, January 5, 1865.

[14] Letter III, January 21, 1865.

The exact number of stories written by Louisa Alcott for *The Flag of Our Union* and their dates of appearance cannot be accurately determined at the present time. The most complete run of this periodical owned by the Library of Congress has now been stored away for safe-keeping with the result that a thorough investigation of the stories by A. M. Barnard is now impossible. The issues of 1865 owned by the Boston Public Library and the few odd numbers at the Widener Library have contributed to the identification of three works and have corroborated Miss Alcott's choice of the pseudonym, A. M. Barnard.

In a letter of January 5, 1865, Elliott referred to the coming publication of Miss Alcott's story, *V. V. or Plots and Counterplots*, which was to appear in *The Flag* "By a Well Known Author" in four installments during February, 1865.[15] Elliott remarked that he intended to print it in *The Flag* "in place of publishing it as a novelette in cheap style." Had Miss Alcott consented to the use of her own name the story would have brought her an additional twenty-five dollars.[16] It appears either that Elliott decided to return to his original plan of issuing *V. V.* in novelette form or that the tale enjoyed considerable popularity for the firm published it during the same year as a ten-cent novelette in their series of "Standard American Authors." Hence it appeared in octavo size, 100 pages in length and bound in blue wrappers bearing the caption "V. V. By A. M. Barnard complete" centered within a medallion on the front cover. According to the Union Catalogue there is only one copy of this publication in an American library, which is catalogued in The New York Public Library under the name of A. M. Barnard.[17]

[15] *The Flag of Our Union.* Vol. XX, no. 5, February 4, 1865, pp. 73-75; no. 6, February 11, 1865, pp. 88-91; no. 7, February 18, 1865, pp. 105-107; no. 8, February 25, 1865, pp. 121-123.

[16] Letter I, January 5, 1865.

[17] *V. V.* was copyrighted by Thomes & Talbot in 1865. *The Flag* had a special column under the heading of "Ten Cent Novelettes" advertising these cheap thrillers. To date the announcement of *V. V.* has not been traced. It is listed, however, as number 80 on the novelette cover. Two later thrillers by Miss Alcott, appearing

That Elliott was satisfied with the suitability of *V. V.* for *The Flag* is indicated in a letter of January 7, 1865, in which he begged for additional material. "I should be pleased to have you write me some stories for the 'Flag' of about 25 to 40 pages of such MSS. as 'V. V.' " Again he entreated her to have the story appear under her own name. According to Elliott, the offer of sixteen dollars would equal the price paid for a first page story by *The American Union* to which he believed Miss Alcott had formerly contributed.[18] In the same letter he requested a poem or two for *The Flag*. A postscript adds, "I will purchase another novelette of you at any time you may wish to dispose of one."[19] A letter addressed to Miss Alcott two weeks later reiterates the same request. "You may send me anything in either the sketch or novelette line that you do not wish to 'father' or that you wish A. M. Barnard or 'any other man' to be responsible for and if they suit me I will purchase them." He now promised three dollars a column run inside length for sketches written under her own name.[20] Although Miss Alcott's published journal makes no reference to Elliott's repeated demands, she accepted his offer since her story, *A Marble Woman Or The Mysterious Model, A Novel of Absorbing Interest by A. M. Barnard, Author of "V. V. or Plots and Counterplots"* appeared in *The Flag* in four installments from May 20 to June 10, 1865.[21] Elliott's proposal of "a poem or two . . . under your own name" was also met since her poems,

---

under her own name, were published in this series. *The Skeleton in the Closet*, included in Perley Parker's *The Foundling*, pp. 77-99, was issued in November, 1867, as no. 49 and *The Mysterious Key* followed as no. 50 in December, 1867. There is one copy of the former work in a private collection; of the latter there are three known copies, the deposit copy in the Library of Congress and two in private collections.

[18] Letter II. *The American Union*, a four-page periodical, had been purchased from Graves and Weston by Ballou from whom Elliott and Thomes bought it in 1861.

[19] Letter II.

[20] Letter III, January 21, 1865.

[21] *The Flag of Our Union.* Vol. XX, no. 20, May 20, 1865, pp. 313-315; no. 21, May 27, 1865, pp. 329-330; no. 22, June 3, 1865, pp. 345-347; no. 23, June 10, 1865, pp. 361-364.

In The Garret and *The Sanitary Fair*, appeared in March and April, 1865.[22]

Miss Alcott's facility in dashing off these saleable thrillers stimulated Elliott's desire for additional material. In a letter of June, 1865, he asked for another sensation story of about 145 to 150 pages, "such MSS. as your last 'The Marble Woman' so that I can have it by the middle of July."[23] Intensely eager now for her stories, he had become less insistent about her identity and did not care about the use of "any particular name, if you prefer any other nom de plume . . . use it, as it is for one of my cheap novelettes."[24] Although he appeared to be indifferent to her choice of a pseudonym there is some indication that he had boasted the author of *A Marble Woman* and Miss Louisa M. Alcott to be one. In a somewhat apologetic tone to the irate authoress he regretted that she should have any feeling in regard to her nom de plume. "I am sure that I have not given currency to the idea that 'A. M. Barnard' and yourself are identical."[25]

There is no proof whether Elliott had turned a journalistic Judas, but there is indication that his enthusiasm for Miss Alcott's thrillers had not waned during her year's absence abroad. From July, 1865, to August, 1866, she vacationed in Europe, strolling along the shores of Lake Leman, sailing at Vevay, where she met her golden-haired Laurie, quite unmindful of the weekly issues of *The Flag of Our Union.*

A diary entry written shortly after her return at the beginning of August, 1866, refers for the first time to Elliott as "E."; "Found plenty to do as orders from E[lliott] and L[eslie] . . . waited for me."[26] She apparently set to work immediately and completed within a short time *Behind a Mask* which appeared in

[22] Both poems appeared under Miss Alcott's own name in *The Flag of Our Union*, Vol. XX, no. 11, March 18, 1865, p. 166, and no. 16, April 22, 1865, p. 254.

[23] Letter IV, June 15, 1865.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] August, 1866, Cheney, op. cit., p. 184.

The Flag after August 11, 1866.[27] In Elliott's opinion this was a story of peculiar power. "[I] have no doubt that many readers will be quite as much fascinated with it as I was myself while reading the manuscript."[28] He now offered the fairly popular authoress sixty-five dollars for this story and five dollars for each poem signed "by Miss Alcott," asking for another thriller to be ready by the twentieth of September.[29] His offer of sixty-five dollars was apparently rejected since Miss Alcott's journal for the period states that she received seventy-five dollars from E. for a story as well as five dollars for a poem.[30]

Elliott's demand for another story for September twentieth was also met. Miss Alcott writes, "E. . . . wanted a long story in 24 chapters and I wrote it in a fortnight 125 pages."[31] Apparently in her fervor she had not realized that even *The Flag of Our Union* had set certain limits to the sensational character of its contributions, for much to her own surprise she records in September, 1866, "E. would not have it saying it was too long and sensational."[32] But A. M. Barnard was not to be balked. She curbed her passion somewhat for the too bloody and the too thunderous and submitted another tale, *The Abbot's Ghost or Maurice Treherne's Temptation*, the last issue of which is to be found in *The Flag of Our Union* of January 26, 1867.[33]

It cannot be determined at the present whether others of Miss Alcott's stories appeared in later issues of *The Flag of Our Union*. With the publication of *Little Women* in October, 1868, Miss Alcott could have easily afforded to sever all association with A. M.

[27] Letter V, August 11, 1866.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] August, 1866: "One [tale] for E. for which he paid $75, also a bit of poetry for $5." Cheney, op. cit., p. 184.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Cheney, op. cit., p. 185.

[33] *The Abbot's Ghost, or Maurice Treherne's Temptation. A Christmas Story by A. M. Barnard, Author of "V. V.," "A Marble Woman," "Behind A Mask," etc. etc.* Vol. XXVII, no. 4, January 26, 1867.

Barnard. To Jo now was relegated the task of submitting her thrillers to the firm of Dashwood and Company. It was her progenitor who could now smile with some sympathy at her heroine's sallies into the domain of blood and thunder and who could recall, perhaps with some reluctance, the career of A. M. Barnard, successful contributor to penny dreadfuls.

Five Letters from James R. Elliott to Louisa M. Alcott[34]

I

Journal Building, 118 Washington Street, Boston

Louisa M. Alcott Jan. 5. 1865

Dear Madam,

I forward you this evening the 3 first copies of the "Flag" in its new form. I think it is now a literary paper that none need to blush for, and a credit to contribute to its columns rather than otherwise.

Now I have a proposition to make you. I want to publish your story "V. V." in it in place of publishing it as a novelette in cheap style, as I had intended, and will give you $25. more for the story provided I can publish it under your own name.

Please look the "Flag"over and let me know as early as Saturday & oblige.

Very truly yours

J. R. Elliott *Editor*

II

118 Washington Street, Jan. 7, 1865

Dear Miss Alcott,

I should be pleased to have you write me some stories for the "Flag" of about 25 to 40 pages of such MS. as "V. V." I want them over your own name of course, and will give you $2.00 a column (short columns you will notice) for them. That rate will be fully equal to $16.00 for a first page story in the "American Union" which paper I think you have contributed to while it was under the management of Messrs. Graves & Weston. Will you not contribute a poem or two for the "Flag" also? I do not know as that is in your line, if it is I shall be glad to recieve[*sic*] poems from your pen. I have entered your name on our gratis list & you will receive the "Flag" regularly.

Very truly yours

J. R. Elliott

P. S. I will purchase another novelette of you at any time you may wish to dispose of one. "V. V." will be commenced in No. 5 about two weeks. What title

[34] Louisa M. Alcott Manuscripts, Box II. Houghton Library, Harvard College, Cambridge.

would you suggest in place of "V. V."? Or what for a second title? Please answer at your earliest convenience. J. R. E.

III

Boston Jan. 21, 1865

Dear Miss Alcott,

You may send me anything in either the sketch or novelette line that you do not wish to "father" or that you wish A. M. Barnard or "any other man" to be responsible for & if they suit me I will purchase them. I will pay for poems under your own name. Also I will give you $3.00 per column (run inside length) for sketches under your own name. Let me hear from you.

Very truly yours
J. R. Elliott

IV

63 Congress Street, June 15, 1865

Dear Miss Alcott,

Have you written anything in the novel line you would like to have me publish "by A. M. Barnard" author of "V. V.", "The Marble Woman", etc. etc.? If not can you furnish me with a sensational story of about 145 to 150 pages such MSS. as your last "The Marble Woman" so that I can have it by the middle of July? I dont care about even any particular name, if you prefer any other nom de plume for the one story use it, as it is for one of my cheap novelettes.

I will give you $50 for such a story and I dont want it to exceed 150 pages of MSS the size of "The Marble Woman"—140 pages will answer or 145 will be better. By the way my friends think the "Marble Woman" is just splendid; & *I* think no author of novels need be ashamed to own it for a bantling. I am sorry you should have had any feeling in regard to the nom de plume. I am sure that I have not given currency to the idea that "A. M. Barnard" & yourself are identical.

Please let me hear from you by return mail if possible in regard to the short novel.

Very truly yours
J. R. Elliott

V

63 Congress Street, August 11, 1866

Dear Miss Alcott,

The story entitled "Behind a Mask" is accepted and I think it is a story of peculiar power and have no doubt that many readers will be quite as much fascinated with it as I was myself while reading the manuscript. I will give you $65 for it. That amount awaits your order.

I should like another by the 20th of September. Can I have one? I should be happy to pay you $5 each for 2 or 3 poems by *Miss Alcott.*

Very truly yours
J. R. Elliott

That "Gilded Age" Again: An Attempt to Unmuddle the Mystery of the Fifty-seven Variants[1]

By Frank C. Willson

BACK in the good old ante-primum-bellum-mundi days the late Merle Johnson, pioneering in *A Bibliography of Mark Twain*, tackled one of the most complex problems ever to confront the compiler of an American-author bibliography.

The popularity of the author whose books he undertook to describe resulted in first editions numbering thousands of copies, and the great volume and varied character of this author's works, together with their sale by subscription methods and in numerous styles of binding, made the job one of multiple complications.

Because of their quantity, most of the first editions of Mark Twain were never genuinely rare. They were in existence somewhere and although large numbers have been read to pieces and otherwise destroyed, many still remain but their owners hang onto them and the rare book market is never glutted with copies. A short time before Merle Johnson's first *Bibliography of Mark Twain* was published in 1910, a presentation copy of the first edition of *Tom Sawyer* was catalogued by a leading American rare book dealer for $10,[2] and other Mark Twain first editions were catalogued correspondingly low in those days. But, as Merle Johnson stated in the introduction of his Mark Twain bibliog-

[1] Fifty-seven is here merely a figure of speech. There may be less and there could be more.

[2] Goodspeed's Bookshop. Catalogue, No. 74, Lot No. 66, December, 1909.

raphy, ". . . a single press worked slowly. After a few hundred were printed the sheets were inspected for errors and changes made in the plates . . . often the change was made after a very few copies." With this fact in view, Merle Johnson examined and compared all the copies of each title he found in an endeavor to locate the earliest of these changes, and the results of this search, as disclosed in his Mark Twain bibliography, focussed the collector's mind on acquiring the earliest state of a Mark Twain book instead of just a first edition of it.

This was a great incentive to the Mark Twain collector, adding a zest to the quest which he had not hitherto known besides causing him to junk much of his earlier collection and rebuild it in many of its titles. Previously to the 1910 Mark Twain bibliography there were only two or three genuine rarities among the Twain first editions, but this happy thought of Merle Johnson's not only made those rarities still rarer but created a number of so-called "first issues" among the other titles that began giving those original rarities a run for their money. *Tom Sawyer,* which was a common enough book before, now began to command prices which would have brought a blush to the iron-clasped cheeks of a virgin incunable. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn,* one of the commonest of all, with an initial release of thirty thousand copies, developed so many variant states that it became a bibliographer's nightmare and still is a cause of much dissension of opinion.

To some of us, it is the changes in life that make life interesting, and so it is with the changes in the status of Mark Twain's first editions. They continue to keep interest alive in the collector who acquires them. One's collection is always in a state of flux and apt to develop late issues in unexpected places at any moment. At the present moment *The Gilded Age* bids fair to join the inimitable "Huck Finn" and become another bibliographer's nightmare, with a delirium tremens of points, counterpoints and pseudo-points, all embroidered within a border of gouges, broken type and perfect or missing letters.

For the investment collector who buys his books in the same frame of mind in which he buys his stocks and bonds—with the hope of cutting future coupons and declaring dividends on every purchase—this matter of "first state" is no doubt a disgusting "state" of affairs. But for the collector who loves the sport of the chase for the sake of the chase and does not expect to get rich from the quarry, it is ideal, for it keeps him always on the run. He has the thrill of hunting down and trapping each title several times during his lifetime and the added thrill of never feeling quite sure that there is not another state somewhere to be had which is even earlier than his earliest one. To the lover of security and securities, we do not recommend the collecting of Mark Twain's first editions, but they are perfect game for the sportsman.

The author of the immortal "Huck," in an argument regarding statistics, once suggested that he could prove anything by statistics if you would allow him to pick the statistics. Just what future bibliographer he had in mind has not been determined, but with this thought in view we approach the bibliography of *The Gilded Age.*

Most of Mark Twain's books prior to 1890 were sold only by subscription. *The Gilded Age* was one of these subscription books and was published by the American Publishing Company of Hartford, Connecticut. William H. Lockwood of Hartford was the electrotyper whose slug appears on the verso of the title-page. Without an intimate knowledge of how this company published its Mark Twain books of seventy years ago, any dogmatic statement, about this or that copy of *The Gilded Age* being a first issue or first state because of points on certain pages, does not appear to be justified. The first editions of the Mark Twain books published by the American Publishing Company ran as large as five and ten thousand copies and were scattered widely over the United States. To find and compare fifty first editions of any of these titles would be a difficult task to-day, but even if we did

round up—let us say—fifty copies of *The Gilded Age* dated 1873 and 1874 could we even then be sure that any particular one of these fifty was a first state or a first issue of all the other thousands of unseen copies published with those dates? It would seem to be legitimate to draw attention to peculiarities which one copy of a book has and another does not have and assume from this internal evidence that one copy is of an earlier state than the other. This over a period of time and a comparison of many copies may develop the "earliest recorded state" or the copy with the "most recorded points." But are page points definitely an indication of priority of issue for all the pages in a book? With the American Publishing Company's Mark Twain books the evidence does not seem to justify such a conclusion.

This publisher was apparently entirely indifferent when producing a book in quantity whether the signatures composing the book were assembled with any regard to the order in which they were printed. Consequently a point found on any page of one of these books may be valid only for the particular signature in which it is found, possibly even for only half of a signature since the sheet was printed first on one side and later on the other so that it could be possible for one side to be number one from the press and the other side could be number five hundred or even one thousand. After this second printing these sheets would then be folded and gathered as signatures in book sequence. They were perhaps given a preliminary trimming to allow for the insertion of the full-page illustrations before going to the stitching room. We assume the bindery started to work as soon as possible after the printing began and that the first run of sheets was rushed through to the binders and in this way an earliest issue of the book might be created long before the entire first edition of sheets was printed. Perhaps each day's printing went to the binders in this manner and the first corrections or changes in the plates may have been made very early in the printing. Being a subscription book, it seems likely that several hundred or a thousand sets of prospectus

pages would be used up in making the prospectuses. These would need to be sent in advance to the individual book agents all over the country who were to secure the subscriptions for the book. The number of handlings of the sheets and signatures during the process of printing and assembling these old books would make it seem to require almost a miracle for *all* the pages in any copy of *The Gilded Age* to be among the earliest ones off the press. With this consideration in view it would seem advisable for the collector of *The Gilded Age* to concentrate on the copies having the most errors uncorrected and not worry about those rather unprovable words, "first state" or "first issue." Perhaps we should make it the copy with the most "recorded points," as attention has been attracted to type defects on certain pages of this book.

The bibliographical history of *The Gilded Age* is not uninteresting. The first startling incident happened in 1898 when the late P. K. Foley turned up a copy with a title-page dated 1873. In his checklist of *American Authors 1795-1895*, published three years before, Mr. Foley had listed *The Gilded Age* as an 1874 book, so in his catalogue containing the 1873 copy he appended the following note: "No copy of 'The Gilded Age' bearing the title-page date here quoted has been previously noticed. Its present cataloguer's enquiries and personal efforts during several years have failed to reveal any copy dated earlier than 1874, which was also believed by the authors of the work to be the date given on the first copies issued."[3] Again, in 1902, Mr. Foley in cataloguing another copy with an 1873 date gives a slightly different note. He states, "Only another copy and that here offered of 'The Gilded Age' with date as given appear to have been noticed. Even the authors knew of no copy dated earlier than 1874."[4] In the first note *the authors believed 1874 to be the date given on the first copies issued;* in the second note the *authors knew of no*

[3] P. K. Foley. Catalogue No. 3, Lot No. 49, March, 1898.

[4] P. K. Foley. Catalogue No. 11, Lot No. 76, April, 1902.

copy dated earlier than 1874. Did Mr. Foley have letters from the authors when he made these statements in his catalogues and when he gave the date as 1874 in his *American Authors, 1795-1895?* Those of us who remember P. K. Foley will feel sure that he never allowed those notes even in his catalogues unless he had the letters or their equivalent.

"The real test of the first edition of *The Gilded Age* may be found on page 403. No illustration is to be found there in the first printing . . ." So wrote Merle Johnson in his *Bibliography of Mark Twain,* New York, 1910. He repeated the above quotation in his *Revised Bibliography* of the same author a quarter of a century later. The last sentence of this statement is still correct.

It was a good point—a definite change purposely made in the manufacture of the book—and it stood for years unquestioned in spite of long-known variations existing in many different copies. Whether the title-page was dated 1873 or 1874, so long as the tail-piece, "Philip Leaving Laura," was not present as called for in the list of illustrations, such a copy was a first printing of the first state of the first issue of the first edition, variously so called. It was a much better point than the split letter i which divided *The Jumping Frog*—a book with much broken type of an earlier vintage than the particular i decided upon.

Thirty-three years ago, when Merle Johnson published his first Twain bibliography, he had some advantages which no longer existed at the time he revised the book twenty-five years later. Mark Twain's books themselves were younger, and if questions arose on points of issue there were men whom Johnson could question, still among the living, who had worked on the books or knew about their origin. Among the accepted facts handed down to us in regard to the creation of *The Gilded Age* there are a few which may be of service in clearing up its now complicated bibliography.

Charles Dudley Warner and Mark Twain commenced their collaboration on the novel which became *The Gilded Age* in Feb-

ruary, 1873, and they finished it sometime in April, 1873.[5]

An 1873 title-page was deposited in Washington to secure copyright on April 23, 1873.[6]

Copyright copies of the *book* were not filed in Washington until January 6, 1874.[7]

Merle Johnson once owned a copy with an author's presentation inscription dated December 24, 1873, and records of the American Publishing Company show that it was actually published some days before this date.[8]

Albert Bigelow Paine, writing in 1912 in *Mark Twain: A Biography*, says, "*The Gilded Age* had been issued a day or two before Christmas (1873), and was already in its third edition, (January 27, 1874). By the end of January 26,000 copies had been sold, a sale that increased to 40,000 copies a month later."

The American Publishing Company's records also show that the first sixty copies of *The Gilded Age* which came from the bindery were sent out stitched, without covers, for review purposes. One of these review copies—the one sent to *The Boston Transcript*—has survived. This copy carried only the imprint of the American Publishing Company on its title-page with the date 1874.[9]

The problem of the variant title-pages found in first editions of *The Gilded Age* is one of the complicated curiosities which confront the collector of the book. We do not yet know how many there were but it seems doubtful if any other American first edition can compete with this one in the number of different title-pages which have been discovered. First, we have the two dates. Some title-pages are dated 1873 and some are dated 1874. The 1873 title-page has been noted in two different formats, one of which lacks the name of one of the illustrators (White) on the

[5] A. B. Paine. *Mark Twain: A Biography*, New York, 1912, Vol. 1, p. 478.

[6] Jacob Blanck. *The Gilded Age*. In: *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.

[7] Merle Johnson. *A Bibliography of Mark Twain*, New York, 1910, p. 32.

[8] *Ibid.*, page 32.

[9] *Ibid.*, page 33.

title, and the slug of the electrotyper, Lockwood, on the verso of this title-page. This one has been known as *the pirated* title-page, because Mr. Frank Bliss—an officer of the American Publishing Company—upon examining one of these title-pages asserted that his company had never owned any such fonts of type.[10] Then we have the *single imprint* title-pages which carry only the imprint, American Publishing Company, and the *double imprint* title-pages which have underneath the American Publishing Company the imprint of their distributor in the particular territory to which the copy of the book was shipped. These double imprint title-pages occur with either date, 1873 or 1874, and we do not know how many variants of this type there were. One for each wholesale agent apparently—multiplied by two because of the two dates and still further multiplied because it has also been noted that the line, American Publishing Company, in the imprint is sometimes followed by a period, sometimes followed by a comma, and sometimes has no punctuation mark after it.

Merle Johnson did not solve this title-page problem in either the 1910 *Mark Twain Bibliography* or the revised edition of 1935. For collation he used an 1874 *single imprint* title-page in 1910 and in 1935 he used an 1874 *double imprint* title-page, under a chronological heading 1873-1874. He then adds an explanatory note on the "pirated" *American Publishing Company 1873* title-page; along with information that late states of *The Gilded Age* (those with the cut on page 403) have been noted in copies bearing the 1873 date as well as in those with the 1874 date.

We do not know the exact number of copies of the first printing of *The Gilded Age* but, proceeding from the facts previously stated to assumptions, it seems safe to assume that it was a large one, following as it did two very popular books by Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad* and *Roughing It*. Ten thousand copies would seem to be a modest estimate in view of the forty thousand copies sold by February, 1874. We do know that Mark Twain expected

[10] *Ibid.*, page 32.

The Gilded Age to be published early in the fall of 1873[11] and that it was not published until a few days before Christmas of that year. Perhaps it suffered a delay from the multiplicity of title-pages. They may well have been one of the publisher's headaches, which he has now passed on to the bibliographer. To explain them we have to continue our assumptions made on the single fact of their existence.

Mark Twain, popular as he was with his public, was not popular with the rank and file of American booksellers. Even forty years after *The Gilded Age* had been published there were many oldtimers among the retail bookdealers who could not forgive his alliance with their enemy, the subscription publishing houses. The antagonism between the subscription publishing houses and the retail booksellers began before Mark Twain's books arrived on the scene, but because of the tremendous popularity of his books the bookseller's wrath focussed on Mark. Customers came to the bookseller asking to buy a copy of *Innocents Abroad* or *Roughing It* or *The Gilded Age*, and the bookseller not only could not make a profitable sale, but he could not even obtain a copy of any of the books to satisfy his customer. Consequently Mark Twain became a pain in the retail bookseller's neck as well as a thorn in the side of his business.

The "pirated" 1873 title-page found in some copies of *The Gilded Age* is assumed to be evidence of conniving on the part of one of the wholesale agents of the American Publishing Company, who in order to sell copies to the forbidden booksellers without being detected by the publishers, had this title-page inserted to replace the one containing his own name. Let it be further assumed (without book evidence) that the American Publishing Company may have had some trouble with this "black market" in distributing the two earlier books of Mark Twain's, and that a brainstorm ensued down in their Hartford headquarters out of which evolved the peculiar idea which resulted in

[11] *Mark Twain's Letters*, New York, 1917, Vol. 1, p. 205.

the numerous title-pages of genuine origin. This idea was the double imprint on the title-page instead of the multiple imprint which they had used on *The Innocents Abroad* and *Roughing It*. The title-pages to those books carried *all* their distributors' names underneath the American Publishing Company and involved the use of only one set up. In *The Gilded Age, only* that distributor's name in the particular territory to which the copies of the book were shipped was printed underneath that of the publisher. By doing this, if copies of the book were found for sale in the forbidden bookstores they could tell from just which agent or agents the books came.

This trap to catch the distributor who was breaking his contract, if such it was, must have involved considerable extra work in the manufacturing of the books, for the genuine title-pages are all an integral part of the first signature of *The Gilded Age*. No matter in which way the remaining signatures of the book might be piled, these variant title-pages would require the first signatures to be kept in individual stacks, up to the number of the different distributors. Orders, from Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Toledo, Syracuse, Boston, San Francisco, New Orleans, Cincinnati—and we don't know how many others—each order had to have the first signature with the title-imprint from that city selected and then bound with any remaining signature sets of the book. It meant plenty of extra work, but apparently it was done. It would seem likely that, as far as the first signatures go, those with the 1873 dates were printed earlier than those with the 1874 dates. The book was delayed—maybe it wouldn't be ready until after the first of the new year—, so first signatures of single and double imprints were also printed with the 1874 date. Which of these lots of first signatures were then bound up with the earliest printed sheets of the rest of the book, and does any copy exist having an 1873 title-page with the sheets in an earlier state than the earliest state which can be found in an 1874 copy? A copy with the presentation inscription of Charles Dudley Warner to his brother

and dated Dec. 24, 1873, has an 1874 title-page. The copy sent *The Boston Transcript*, stitched without covers, also has an 1874 title-page. Both these copies carry only the imprint of the American Publishing Company.

What was the purpose of these single imprint American Publishing Company copies in the multiple title-page scheme? Was there a territory around Hartford which the American Publishing Company reserved for itself? If so we may assume that it had its own agents bringing subscriptions direct to the factory and that other subscriptions may have reached them direct from advertising. For these orders, copies with only the American Publishing Company imprint would be desirable and it seems possible that the company might get quicker returns and more profit by filling its own direct orders first. So far all *recorded* copies of *The Gilded Age* having this single imprint title-page bear the date 1874 with the exception of the spurious or "pirated" 1873 title-page copies.

Since the publication of Merle Johnson's *Revised Bibliography of Mark Twain* in 1935 in which Johnson states the real test of a first edition of *The Gilded Age* to be the lack of a cut on page 403, several additional peculiarities have been put forward as "points" of superior quality. What copies of *The Gilded Age* shall we consider as being the collectors' copies of to-day? Shall we look for one with no signs of typewear and hope it may be the first set of sheets to come from the press, bound in the first book to come from the bindery and then the first book to leave the factory to fill the first customer's order!—or, shall we try to decide from changes in the text which was the first error of commission or omission to be corrected which made a definite change in the book? To find the copy with perfect type throughout seems a task as difficult and a quarry as elusive as finding The Holy Grail. It probably never existed. Evidence does accumulate, however, to encourage the belief that the first change purposely made while the book was being manufactured is one that can be found.

We do know that enough copies exist to show that four definite changes were made in first editions of *The Gilded Age* other than the title-page variants and dates, and the evidence offered by some of these copies indicates that none of the four changes was made at the same time.

When the tail-piece was added to the earlier blank space on page 403 it was a change made on purpose and all subsequent sheets carried this cut.

When an additional title was added to the list of illustrations on page xvi and *No. 211 Alice* became *No. 212 Alice* with all the other numbers from 194 to 212 shifted, this was also a purposeful change affecting all later printings.

When the name Eschol was eliminated throughout the book and the name Beriah substituted, we have Mark Twain's word for it that Beriah was a later idea.[12]

In what order were these changes made and were any of them the first correction to be made while the sheets were going through the press? A table showing a comparison of six copies—all variants—three with title-pages dated 1873 and three with title-pages dated 1874, is provided herewith and gives some interesting inferences on these textual changes and on certain variations ascribed to typewear. In this small group of copies—much too small to be dogmatic over the results—the first textual change does *not* appear to have been the old reliable tail-piece added at page 403, nor to have been the *212 Alice* added on page xvi—instead it seems to have been the correction of an error which occurred on page 353 and made necessary the elimination of two lines of text at the top of this page. These two lines in the uncorrected copies repeat in error the last two lines on the previous page.

An examination of the table of the six variants shows that this error on page 353 is present in but two of the six copies—those numbered one and two. Number one is a copy having a *genuine*

[12] Mark Twain. *The American Claimant*, New York, 1892, p. [7].

double imprint 1873 title-page, and number two is a copy having a *genuine single imprint 1874 title-page.*

The *tail-piece lacking on page 403*, standard point for more than twenty-five years and listed as "the real test" in the 1910 and 1935 bibliographies, occurs in copies numbers one, two and three in this table. Number three copy, it will be noticed, does not have the point at page 353, this page being in the later corrected state.

List of illustrations ends with No. 211 Alice on page xvi. This point occurs in copies numbers one, two, three and four of this table, indicating that the correction was made later than the two previous changes.

Eschol on page vii under Chapter V and other places throughout the book. The point occurs in all but copy number six in this table, in which copy the name is changed to Beriah from which we conclude this change was the latest of the four.

Changes of punctuation on the title-pages of the six copies in this table favor the *period* after the word, Company.[13] This occurs in copies number one, two and three. A comma shows up in copies number four and five, while number six has no punctuation after this word.

An analysis of the typographical variations due to typewear or poor presswork in the six copies in our table reveal that the copies number one and two, which are the only ones to have the uncorrected error on page 353, are also the only ones to have the *running head at page 302—A Frenchman From Cork* in perfect type. The other variations show a mixture of early and late signatures in all six copies in the chart if we accept perfect type as a criterion for dating the sheets.

[13] An 1873 copy of *The Gilded Age* slightly variant from the Copy Number 1 in the table has turned up since this article was written. In the title-page of this copy a comma occurs after the line, American Publishing Company. The distributor's imprint is F. G. Gilman & Co., Chicago, Ill., instead of Nettleton & Co., Cincinnati, O. Point "f" in the table is in perfect type in this copy while the other points are as described under Copy Number 1.

	THE GILDED AGE. By MARK TWAIN and CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER. AN EXAMINATION OF SIX VARIANT COPIES. IN THEIR APPARENT CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER AS SHOWN BY DEFINITE TEXTUAL CHANGES DURING THE YEARS 1873 AND 1874.	COPY NO. 1 (*Imprint.*) HARTFORD: AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY. NETTLETON & CO., CINCINNATI, O. 1873 (Genuine title-page and with period after COMPANY.)	COPY NO. 2 (*Imprint.*) HARTFORD: AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY. 1874 (Genuine title-page and with period after COMPANY.)	COPY NO. (*Imprint.*) H FORD: AME PUBLISHING PANY. 1874 (Genuine tit and with perio COMPANY.)
a.	Page 353. First state has 38 lines of text with lines one and two repeating last two lines on page 352.	38	38	36 lines o
b.	Page 403. First state has no tail-piece illustration. Later states have cut of "Philip leaving Laura."	No tail-piece	No tail-piece	No tail-pi
c.	Page xvi. First state has list of illustrations ending with "No. 211 Alice." Later states end with "No. 212 Alice."	211	211	211
d.	Page vii. Under Chapter V Eschol Sellers, later changed to Beriah Sellers here and throughout the book.	Eschol	Eschol	Eschol
e.	TYPOGRAPHICAL VARIATIONS PERHAPS DUE TO TYPEWEAR OR POOR PRESSWORK. Page 246. Fifth line from bottom. Hallelujah flush to line. No comma after.	Perfect type, flush to line and no comma.	Perfect type, flush to line and no comma.	Perfect type, to line and n ma.
f.	Page 320. CHAPTER XXXV and end words in line below "M-ix-in" and "zaki colo" decapitated.	Decapitated	Perfect type	Perfect t
g.	Page 302. Running head A FRENCHMAN FROM CORK, perfect type in earliest. Later decapitated from M to K in Cork.	Perfect type	Perfect type	Decapita
h.	Page 409, line 14. In Washington the W must be present, later missing.	Present with small spot on 3rd leg.	Present with slight spot on 3rd leg.	Present and type.
i.	Page 473. Perfect C in CHAPTER, and perfect L in Le Tartuffe in the 3rd line below. For more, see *P. W.*, July 20, 1940.	Perfect C L almost missing	Perfect C L almost missing	Perfect L almost m
j.	Page 280, line 18. First state has period at end of line. Later missing.	Period	Period	Period
k.	Three pages of advertisements found in some copies with misprint *truex inde* later *true index*, page 3 of advertisements.	No advertisements	No advertisements	No advertis

COPY NO. 4 (*Imprint.*) HARTFORD: CAN PUBLISH- COMPANY, 1873 pirated inserted e from different type and lacking one of the illus- names. Verso has ht notice but not yper's slug. This as a comma after NY.)	COPY NO. 5 (*Imprint.*) HARTFORD: AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, F. G. GILMAN & CO., CHICAGO, ILL. 1873 (Genuine title-page and with comma after COMPANY.)	COPY NO. 6 (*Imprint.*) HARTFORD: AMERICAN PUBLISHING COMPANY 1874 (Genuine title-page and with no punctuation after COMPANY.)	Sources of the points of textual variations and of the typographical variations. Jacob Blanck. *The Gilded Age, A Collation.* In: *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.
36	36	36	Now first published
as tail-piece	Has tail-piece	Has tail-piece	Merle Johnson, *A Bibliography of Mark Twain*, New York, 1910.
211	212 Alice	212	Jacob Blanck, *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.
Eschol	Eschol	Beriah	Merle Johnson, *A Bibliography of Mark Twain*, New York, 1910.
t type, flush to d no comma.	Perfect type, flush to line and no comma.	Flush to line but end letter is worn and also end letters on lines above and below, are worn.	Jacob Blanck, *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.
Perfect type	Perfect type	Perfect type	Now first published
Decapitated	Decapitated	Decapitated	Now first published
t, but with larg- t than previous	Present and looks like slight wear.	Present but looks definitely worn.	Jacob Blanck, *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.
Perfect C Perfect L	Perfect C L almost missing	Bashed in C but Perfect L	Jacob Blanck, *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.
No period	No period	No period	Jacob Blanck, *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.
irated copy has endpapers, one blank leaf at d, only 2 pages rtisements.	No advertisements	Three pages of advertisements with the corrected *true index* on page 3 of advertisements under Josh Billings.	Jacob Blanck, *The Publishers' Weekly*, July 20, 1940.

In *The Gilded Age* perfect or imperfect type does not seem to offer as satisfactory a dividing line between the early hundreds and the later thousands of first edition copies as the textual changes do. Let the broken-or-worn-type fan produce a copy of *The Gilded Age* with perfect type throughout and we will acclaim the miracle—and buy the drinks.

We prefer those copies of *The Gilded Age* which *on page 353 have thirty-eight lines of text* (*the first two lines of text repeating by error the last two lines of text on the previous page*). Our preference does not mean that we claim a copy having this point is a "first issue" or "first state" or "first printing" of all the other pages in the book. However, as far as our investigation has gone this point appears to be the King of the recorded points to date and it occurs in copies of 1873 and of 1874. We would certainly reject those copies of *The Gilded Age* which lacked this point.

In copies having this King-point we would hope to find the other textual changes which, continuing the nomenclature of chess to indicate their chronological importance, include the Queen-point or *lack of a tail-piece on page 403*, the Rook-point or the *list of illustrations ending with No. 211 Alice on page xvi*, and the Knight-point in which the Knight will be *Eschol and not Beriah throughout the book*.

Bishop-points and pawn-points in order of importance might be made of the type variations—g, h, j and e, as shown on the chart.

The time may come when we will shout "Long Live the King-point" over some yet undiscovered fact, but *The Gilded Age* will continue to be a fascinating book, for the bibliographer, for the collector, and for some of its readers.

Bibliographical Notes

Incunabula

THE "EPISTOLAE FAMILIARES" OF LEONARDO BRUNI, VENICE, 1495

The *Catalogue of Books Printed in the XVth Century now in the British Museum* and the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* both recognize the fact that this edition was begun by Damianus de Gorgonzola and finished by Petrus de Quarengiis; but both catalogues appear to be in error in their statements as to the division of the work as between the two printers.[1]

There is in point of fact no difficulty in distinguishing between the two fonts — 111R and 109R. Damianus uses an i with a dot and Petrus an i with a stroke; Damianus uses a sharply sloping slender hyphen and Petrus a slightly sloping thick one; Damianus has no question mark and Petrus has one. The two fonts differ quite perceptibly, moreover, in nearly all the capital letters. Several of the capitals of Damianus are relatively thick, whereas the corresponding capitals of Petrus are relatively slender; and several lines in the capitals of Damianus are without serifs, or have inward-pointing serifs only, whereas the corresponding capitals of Petrus have the serifs relatively well developed.

In my own copy, examined in the light of these differences, it is clear that Damianus printed quires a-e and the enclosing sheet (comprising leaves 1 and 6) of quire f; and that Petrus took up the work at this point, printing the two inner sheets of quire f (i.e., the sheet comprising leaves 2 and 5 and the sheet comprising leaves 3 and 4), and quires g-i.

The *BMC* assigns "sheets f2, 3, quires g-i" to Petrus, and the remainder to Damianus. This would give f4 and f5 to Damianus and f2 and f3 to Petrus: a quite impossible division. One is tempted to infer that at some point in the preparation of the *BMC* statement a notation such as "f2-5" was wrongly copied as "f2-3," and that this in turn became "f2, 3."

The *GW*, whose account of quire f corresponds to mine, assigns d3 and d4 to Petrus. In my copy they are certainly by Damianus. It is conceivable that when Petrus came to assemble the printed sheets he found a shortage of the

[1] *BMC*, V, p. 512; *GW*, V, col. 586, No. 5607. This edition is listed by Hain as 1567; by Mlle Pellechet as 1119; and by Miss Stillwell as B1105.

sheet d3-4 as printed by Damianus, and that he ran off some d3-4 sheets of his own to repair the deficiency — so that there may possibly be a divergence between copies in this respect.

—Ernest H. Wilkins

A HITHERTO UNDESCRIBED INCUNABULUM

Missa. De utilitate missae. [Rome: Johann Besicken, after 1500?] 8°.

4 leaves. Sig.: A^4. 24 lines. Types 1:87 G^a [text], 5:140 G [headline on 1^a].

leaf 1: De vtilitate miſſe || S^2 Acerdos qui ſine peccato eſt mortali: & in || bono propoſito ſi non celebrat celeſtem tri-||nitatem priuat gloria & honore: . . . 4b, line 23: . . . Hec & multa alia & || plura q̄ dici & ſcribi poſſunt de hoc ſacramēto. || Laus Deo. ||

Bound in modern brown sheepskin, blind tooled.

According to the *Gesamtkatalog*, one of three known copies, the other two being in the Staatsbibliothek, Bremen, and in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Purchased at a sale in London (Sotheby, July 21, 1930, lot 257).

Second Census, M538.

—Curt F. Bühler

Americana

MORE DATA ON A PROPOSED "BIBLIOTHECA AMERICANA" OF THE REV. ARTHUR HOMER, D.D., IN 1799

In the Papers of the Society, vol. 36, 1942, pp. 246 ff., I described Dr. Homer's "Proposals for Printing by Subscription" a work to be "entitled Bibliotheca Universalis Americana, or an Universal American Library; and the West Indies," but which was never published. Because the "Proposals" were circulated several times from 1799 to 1803, when the plan for subscriptions was discontinued, Dr. Homer has often been saddled erroneously with the compilation of the indifferent and anonymous volume entitled: *Bibliotheca Americana; or, a Chronological Catalogue* [*etc.*], printed in London for J. Debrett, and others, in 1789; and even a copy of the 1789 work in the Harvard College Library has written upon the title-page in no recent hand: "By Arthur Homer D.D. — of St. Mary's Mag. Coll. Oxford."

I am indebted to my professional friend, Mr. Walter B. Briggs, of the Harvard library, for the use of photostat reproductions of the said title-page and the following long and interesting letter of Dr. Homer that he found inserted in the Harvard copy of the anonymous work of 1789. The letter was written to the Rev. William Bentley (1759-1819), the diarist, graduate of Harvard, class of

1777, and for many years pastor of East Church (Unitarian), of Salem, Massachusetts. The letter is printed here verbatim:

Magd: Coll: Oxford
Dec: 31 — 1799

Rev: Sir

I am infinitely obliged to you for the very valuable packet of Information, wch I lately rec^{d} from you upon y^{e} subject of my intended Bibliotheca Americana, & particularly for y^{e} very polite Terms in which it has been communicated to me. In comparing my Notes with the printed Catalogue of your Historical Library, as well as your ms Papers, which accompanied it, I am happy to acknowledge that they both contain much additional Information upon the local History of your Country & the Works of your Provincial writers, which I was before unacquainted with. The only thing which I have to regret is that the size of y^{e} Books, especially in y^{e} printed Catalogue has not been more generally attended to, a distinction wch I mean constantly to point out in my work, as well as the date & place of Publication whenever I can ascertain these circumstances. In every Book indeed, to which I can get access myself I generally make a point to copy out the whole Contents of the Title Page verbatim & literatim as it occurs in y^{e} Author's own Language, with the Number of Pages & the Ornaments, such as Maps Plates, &c. with wch it is accompanied. But this I am sensible w^{d} be an endless task to observe at a distance & not to be expected in the course of correspondence either from myself or the Public. Whether it will be in my power or no before this work is committed to y^{e} press, to make a personal Visit to y^{e} Continent of America I cannot at present determine. Should it so happen, I sh^{d} be particularly happy to avail myself of the opportunity to return you my thanks in propria Persona for your great Civilities at your own place of abode, of which you have given me such a flattering Account in your Letter. May you long retain that simplicity of Manners & those Habits of Industry which at present characterise the Inhabitants of Salem, uninfected with y^{e} general seditions & immoral practises of the Age which prevail in other Places. One part of your Letter, I take particular pleasure in noticing, viz, that in which you speak in such high Terms of the Person to whom I have from corresponding sentiments, though in the midst of his former Enemies, expressed a desire to dedicate my Labours. In this I trust you will be persuaded from the favourable Reception which my Proposals have met with in this Country, especially from the University to which I belong, that I have no reason to repent of the Resolution from any difference of Opinion entertained here at present upon that Account. May this be a happy Omen of a general & cordial Reconciliation between our two Countries, an event, which I w^{d} spare no pains in my power from the most sincere wishes for their mutual Interest & Prosperity to promote —

With these Sentiments & these wishes, the nearest to my heart of all political Events, in these distracted Times, I beg leave to subscribe myself with much esteem & respect

Your much obliged & obed: Servant

Arthur Homer

P. Sc: Should you be so kind as to favour me with any future communications upon the Subject of my intended Publication, to save trouble to yourself & others, who may join you in that office I beg leave to observe that the Provincial Publications are

such as in general I am most deficient in the knowledge of, except those wch occur in y^e^ printed Catalogues of Harvard College & the Philadelphia (Franklinian) Libraries, all of which as well as those of your own Historical Library I am now in possession of. To these I may add every Article, which has been transmitted to this Country, an Account of which occurs in any of our Reviews or Literary Journals, as well as the Journal des Sçavans and the Acta Eruditorum published at Leipsic of all which I have just finished one general alphabetical Catalogue, which I trust will be of great Service in y^e^ future prosecution of my Undertaking.

The Rev: M^r^ Bentley
Salem —
[*Endorsed:*] Homer. American Library

—Victor Hugo Paltsits

AUTHORS OF PAPERS IN THIS ISSUE

The Rev. Vincent Joseph Flynn is Professor of English and Head of the Department at the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. Frank Weitenkampf retired in July, 1942, as Curator of Prints at The New York Public Library.

Miss Leona Rostenberg works in the shop of a New York rare book dealer.

Mr. Frank C. Willson is a book dealer of Melrose, Mass.

Reviews

Brown, Carleton, and Robbins, Rossell Hope. *The Index of Middle English Verse* [*by*] *Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins.* Printed for The Index Society by Columbia University Press, New York, New York, 1943. xix, 785 pp., [1] leaf. Tables. 9¼ x 6¾ inches. $15.00.

With the appearance of the *Index of Middle English Verse* edited by the late Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins, the Index Society presents to the scholarly world its first publication—a work which many of us have been anxiously awaiting. With publication once under way, it is to be hoped that the Society will send forth in a steady stream such useful books as the present one; the others which its prospectus sets forth promise to be no less interesting.

That the volume under discussion is a most valuable contribution to scholarship is self-evident. For the first time students of Middle English poetry possess not only an incipit list worthy to stand beside the *Initia Patrum* and the similar works by Little, Thorndike, Långfors and others, but also one that at the same time provides a complete list of the manuscripts in which these poems are found, an obvious and decided advantage. It has been a laborious undertaking for the editors, and it may truly be said that, in the main, they have met with great success. Since Dr. Robbins points out in his Preface the relationship of the *Index* to its parent, the *Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse*, 1916-1920, and provides various figures and comparisons, it is not the intention of the present reviewer to dwell upon these details. One remark does, however, call for comment: Dr. Robbins speaks of the "poverty" of American libraries in manuscripts of Middle English verse and that "only" five per cent of the total are in this country. I should have expressed this rather differently, since American collectors and libraries have competed for books of this sort only since the turn of the present century and are manifestly late-comers in this field, with little hope (in the normal course of events) of ever improving their position very much. On the other hand, compared with the number and quality of mediaeval French, German, and Italian manuscripts in this country, the English manuscripts are at a decided advantage. Again, in

the case of Classical manuscripts, the proportion of American holdings to the world's total is infinitesimally small and all such manuscripts taken together do not, from the point of view of literary content and textual value, approach the importance of a single Middle English manuscript now in the Huntington Library; I refer, of course, to the Ellesmere Chaucer.

The ultimate goal of any compilation of this sort is, naturally enough, completeness in every detail; equally naturally, this goal has never been — or is ever likely to be — achieved, as everyone who has ever compiled or consulted such a list well knows. As far as the manuscripts or the items contained therein are concerned, there is little enough the present reviewer can add. The only major work which escaped the *Index* (as it did its predecessor) is the Huth manuscript of the *Miroure of Man's Saluacionne,* printed for the Roxburghe Club in 1888. A few other incipits which escaped inclusion may be pointed out. A manuscript described in Quaritch's 1931 catalogue of manuscripts (lot 73) contains an English dedication apparently addressed to Elizabeth, Queen of Henry VII, and therefore probably written before 1500. A New York dealer offered for sale, in his catalogue of January, 1942, a manuscript containing a text on divination by the casting of dice, equally interesting to students of philology and folklore. Two manuscripts known to the editors contain material not listed in the *Index:* the Greg manuscript listed under 2119 (45) contains as well a political poem of 6 lines apparently written about 1460-1470, while Yates Thompson 83 (the "Talbot" Hours—described by James in the Thompson catalogue, II, 218-232) includes not only the listed texts of 914, 1727 and 3748 (though the *Index* does not note that only five stanzas comprising the *Hymn to St. Alban* are preserved here), but also that of 2154 (fol. 132) and a poem beginning "Iesu whom ye serue dayly" (fol. 107b). Additional manuscript entries might have been made for 1168-Extracts (Morgan 4, fol. 74b), 3580 (BM Addit 30506, fol. 169) and 4008 and 4029 (Westminster Abbey 27, fols. 31b and 82); since late transcripts have elsewhere been entered, Dyce 33 can be listed under 2464 and Dyce 34 under 3083. Under 524 is listed a single stanza found at the end of one manuscript of *Troilus and Criseyde;* this is rather better known as the *Envoy by Greneacres* and occurs as a poem of four stanzas at the end of the *Fall of Princes* in the Rylands manuscript and in Pynson's edition (cp. Bergen's edition, III, 1023). There are also further scraps of verse (besides those listed) to be found in the Paston Letters. Compared, however, with the two thousand odd manuscripts and more than 4300 items known to the editors, this list of omissions is very slight indeed.

When we turn to the notations concerning English incunabula, on the other hand, we are confronted by a different situation. It has always struck this reviewer as curious that in mediaeval fields—particularly, of course, in the case of the fifteenth century—the scholarly world is sharply divided (with a few exceptions) into "manuscript men" and "printed book men," with neither group knowing or caring very much about the methods of the other. Perhaps this reviewer is prejudiced since force of circumstance has compelled him to divide his time equally between these fields; however, the problems and methods proper to these two are so similar that it is doubly curious that this division exists at all, not only among the literary historians but among the librarians as well. The present work suffers because of this, since it is clear that printed books were not subjected to the same scrutiny the manuscripts enjoyed. Obviously a Caxton is as important as any manuscript of the time—and in many cases, a great deal more so. In the absence (for the duration) of the books themselves, one need only turn to the bibliographical reference works by Blades, Crotch, Dibdin, Duff, Schreiber and others to note the omission of quite a number of incipits. Two works of importance thus escaped inclusion: Skelton's *Bowge of Courte* (printed before de Worde left Westminster in 1500) and Earl Rivers's translation of Christine de Pisan's *Proverbes Moraux* (printed by Caxton in 1478). Other bits of verse of varying importance are included in the printed editions (though not in the manuscripts) of the *Life of our Lady*, *Fall of Princes*, *Scala Perfectionis*, *Polychronicon*, *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, *Wednesday's Fast*, *The Foundation of the Chapel of Walsingham*, and in several xylographic prints. A curious case is the *Book of St. Albans;* a large part (though by no means all) of its verse content is quoted from the manuscript copies and later common-place books (such as Richard Hill's Balliol manuscript) and the printed editions are silently ignored. For the *Nut-Brown Maid*, Arnold's *Chronicle* (the main source) is noted but the "soteltes" (reprint, pp. 238-241) held in connection with the appointment of John Morton to the Bishopric of Ely (1479) are not included in the *Index*. The list of Caxtons, Pynsons and de Wordes omitted in the *Index* is too lengthy to be quoted here, but it should be pointed out that to ignore these books altogether or to include them among ordinary reference books when manuscripts copied from them are singled out for detailed information is most unhappy. For example, under 1629, the Huntington manuscript is duly listed though no mention is made of the Caxton edition from which the verses were copied. Again, for 3406, BM Addit 29729 (of 1558) is cited though not the Caxton edition of which this manuscript is a

transcript; furthermore the Caxton edition is the only early source which has the incipit under which the entry is made. For 520 it might have been worth pointing out that the first line begins with "Bydynge" according to Dyce and "Rydynge" as given by Duff (no. 233), if it was not possible to confirm the reading at this time. Under 1919, the Oriel manuscript is cited as a copy of a lost Caxton (which seems doubtful) supposedly printed *ante* 1477 (which is hardly probable). The second edition by Caxton of Lydgate's *Churl and the Bird* is dated 1490 (as in MacCracken's text), though there are excellent reasons for believing it to be in fact the first edition and in any case printed before 1479; incidentally it thus antedates the Huntington manuscript. Item 3584 is said to have been printed in 1449, though this is probably no more than a typographical error for 1499; the same explanation doubtless accounts for the printer "de Machliana" under 4150. Turning to a slightly later date, we may note that 3084 first appeared in Thynne's *Chaucer* of 1532, and that Skeat, in the preface to the facsimile edition, judged that the poem had been composed about 1530.

Though it is perhaps entirely a question of personal preference, the present reviewer regrets that the editors included single couplets, quatrains, and poems consisting of three lines only. Apparently these were entered in the *Index* whenever they were noticed on the blank leaves of manuscripts or when notice of inscriptions of any sort was found in print. But this is a mere beginning. There are hundreds of such bits of verse to be found in or on early printed books, bronzes, cups, epitaphs, mottoes, popular proverbs, rings, brooches, etc. Even a hasty glance through any of the standard works on monumental inscriptions or "sepulchral remains" would have supplied a goodly number of additional poems, if such they may be called. It may well be questioned, however, whether such a search is worth the trouble and whether such verse warrants inclusion in the *Index*. Since some were included, it is rather astonishing not to find:

> The catte, the ratte, and Louell our dogge,
> Rulyth all Englande vnder a hogge.
> (Fabyan. *Chronicle*, 1811, p. 672)

This is certainly one of the best-known couplets of all time and contributed no little to the political turmoils of the reign of Richard III.

Naturally enough, a few *post* 1500 pieces have crept into the *Index:* no. 266—dated circa 1530 by John Saltmarsh (*The Antiquaries Journal*, 1935, pp. 12-16, citing different manuscripts), no. 1778—where line 234 has the date 18 Henry VII (1502), no. 2195—belongs to the sixteenth cen-

tury according to James's catalogue, etc. No. 3614 was written (unless I err greatly) at a *very* much later date than 1500. It seems to have been modelled on the similar inscription found in Harley 1251 (*Index* 302); however, if (as the Harleian catalogue suggests) it refers to Eleanor Worcester, third wife of Charles Somerset, this inscription must itself be dated *post* 1518. Another such inscription is in Egerton 1151, the owner there being "Mysterys felys."

Bibliographical references are full though far from complete; this, for obvious reasons, is a matter of secondary importance. It may, however, be pointed out *inter alia* that the text of 665 was printed by Bergen (*Fall of Princes*, IV, p. 19), that of the Auchinleck fragment of 683 by Nicholson (*Rouland and Vernagu*, Abbotsford Club, 1836, pp. xx-xxvii), manuscripts 11-12 of 716 by Greg (*The Play of Antichrist*, Oxford, 1935), the book tag 1656 by Bowers (*The Gast of Gy*, Leipzig, 1938, p. 41), and the *Epistle of Othea* (3377) by James D. Gordon, Philadelphia, 1942. The Morgan manuscript (not Trinity Dublin 156) was used by Ellis for the Kelmscott edition of the *Penitential Psalms* (*Index* 1961).

It may be thought that this list of additions, corrections and comments is rather extensive—but it is not unduly so in view of the size and scope of the work under discussion. Omissions and minor lapses, as I have said before, are inevitable in works of this sort. The present summary has *not* been compiled merely to find petty faults with an otherwise excellent work but rather in the hope that it may serve as a preliminary outline for a supplement, should the Society ever undertake this. There can be no question that the *Index of Middle English Verse* is a satisfactory piece of research and a valuable bibliographical aid to all students of Middle English literature.

CURT F. BÜHLER

HASKELL, DANIEL C. *The United States Exploring Expedition, 1838-1842, and its Publications, 1844-1874, a Bibliography by Daniel C. Haskell, Bibliographer of the Library; with an Introductory Note by Harry Miller Lydenberg.* New York, The New York Public Library, 1942. xii, 188 pp. Front., plates, facsims. 10 x 7 inches. $3.75.

If every large library in the United States strove toward a publishing program such as that pursued by the New York Public Library, the advancement of scholarship and corresponding increase in library usefulness and prestige would be enormous. Once again the Manhattan institution has set a great example in reprinting from several successive issues of its

Bulletin Haskell's definitive work. Nobly conceived a half-century ago by Wilberforce Eames, probably in connection with his work on Sabin's *Dictionary*, this bibliography was developed and expanded by its present author and dedicated by him to Eames's memory. The result could not have failed to win the master's approval.

The Expedition led by the Navy's Lieutenant Charles Wilkes (1798-1877) remains to this day the greatest exploring adventure ever undertaken by our country. Its vicissitudes of origin, execution and completion were later matched by the epic struggle waged by Wilkes against an ignorant and hostile Congress in getting the results published. For thirty years the fight went on; yet several of the projected twenty-four volumes still remain in manuscript. Congressional appropriations for the writing and printing of the reports totalled half a million dollars. With quarterdeck tactics Wilkes bulled the work along, against such opponents as Senator Toombs, who cried "Throw it into the Potomac; that is the best thing.", and Senator Cameron, whose classic remark in debate was "I am tired of all this thing called science here."

Haskell's treatment of the venture is on a proportionate scale to the original. In addition to a brief history of the Expedition and its publications, full collations are given for the bewildering host of official and non-official issues of the reports. The holdings of one hundred and one libraries, mostly American, are detailed. Books, articles and manuscripts relating to the Expedition and its results are also listed. There is even the text of legislation relating to the Expedition and its publications. The index runs to twenty-four double-column pages. Any errors remaining on the type-packed pages have escaped this reviewer's eye.

If there existed a Pulitzer Prize for Bibliography, this entry should win hands down. It is a monument, and a model.

LAWRENCE CLARK POWELL

Union List of Microfilms: a basic List of Holdings in the United States and Canada. [Compiled by the Committee on Microphotography of the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center and Union Library Catalogue, Philadelphia.] Philadelphia, 1942. xiii, 379 pp. Mimeographed. 10¾ x 8½ inches. $4.00. *Union List of Microfilms Supplement 1. (1942)*, Philadelphia, 1943. xii, 244 pp. Mimeographed. 10¾ x 8½ inches. $3.00.

Unlike other processes of reproduction, microfilm copies of documents can be produced and published in an edition of one. A simplified technique

makes it possible for individuals to copy long runs of material which ordinarily remain unknown, unused by others and never become part of the usual bibliographical system.

In the face of this situation the compilation and publication of a union list of principal microfilm holdings was badly needed. The *List* contains 5221 entries and the *Supplement* 2965 entries. Entries are arranged by author, giving title, publication date of original, number of pages, and the location of the negative and positive.

The compilers of the *Union List* assume that once a film copy is known to exist, arrangements can be made either for a positive made from the negative, or for borrowing a copy through inter-library loan. Unfortunately, this is an assumption not always borne out in fact. A common fault of all union catalogues is that facilities for access to a book or film do not automatically follow upon knowledge of its existence. Experience has shown that most libraries are reluctant to lend microfilms, which are so easily damaged. It would seem part of this difficulty could be avoided if information were given as to whether the owning institution is willing to lend the film, and whether facilities are available for duplicating it.

Nonetheless, the *List* and the *Supplement* should prove to be of very great value. Even a casual examination of the two volumes reveals an astonishingly rich and varied collection of rare and ephemeral material. A few random samples:— The Franklin Papers of the American Philosophical Society, The Colonial Office South Carolina Papers of the Public Record Office, more than 350 Middle English manuscripts of historical, literary and philological interest from the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and a doctoral dissertation on economic factors affecting education in the agricultural community.

There are 8186 entries in the two volumes. Conservatively, we may assume an average of 200 pages for each entry. There are accordingly located here over one and a half million pages of research material, most of it rare and inaccessible. One series of microfilm, Books Printed in England before 1600, is given but one entry although this series alone totals approximately 5000 titles.

Many libraries, and this is especially true of European depositories, do not like to have the same item copied more than once, since to do so subjects the original to needless wear and tear. I know that English librarians very properly take the stand that once a manuscript or rare book has been microfilmed, it should not be necessary to do it again. The existence of the *Union List* should be of great help in avoiding needless re-photographing.

It should be remembered, however, that some of the items listed in the *Union List*, especially manuscripts, were copied at the request of a particular individual for a specific purpose and that the film cannot and should not be used by another without the permission of the library owning the original. Some indication of these restrictions would add to the usefulness of the *List*.

It is the hope of the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center that contemplated microfilm projects, and those completed, will be reported to the center, thus avoiding needless duplication of effort. Further supplements are planned as additional reports are received.

Certainly the compilers are to be complimented on the creation of a bibliographical tool of very considerable value. They have vividly demonstrated that the microfilm technique is "here to stay."

EUGENE B. POWER